LIBRARY OF
WELLESLEY COLLEGE

PURCHASED FROM

SWEET FUND

THE TREATISE OF IRENÆUS OF LUGDUNUM AGAINST THE HERESIES

Early Church Classics

THE TREATISE OF IRENÆUS OF LUGDUNUM AGAINST THE HERESIES

A TRANSLATION OF THE PRINCIPAL PASSAGES, WITH NOTES AND ARGUMENTS

BY

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK

M.A., D.D.

FORMERLY DONNELLAN LECTURER OF DUBLIN UNIVERSITY,
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF KILLALOE.

AUTHOR OF
"IRENÆUS OF LUGDUNUM," "CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA," "THE ATONEMENT AND MODERN THOUGHT," "HEBREW TYPES," "THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY ON THE GOSPEL MIRACLES."

VOL. I

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
LONDON: 68, HAYMARKET, S.W.
1916

96749

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THIS little work consists of a translation of the principal passages of the great treatise of Irenæus against the heresies. It is not suggested that what has not been translated is of little value. A summary of such portions is supplied. But it is hoped that this will serve the student and average reader as an introduction to the deeper study of this great Church classic. Notes have been given wherever they were thought necessary, and the chain of the argument is shown throughout in order to facilitate the understanding of the work as a whole. A fuller and deeper study of the theology of Irenæus, the writer would beg leave to state, is to be found in his *Irenæus of Lugdunum*, recently published by the Cambridge Press.

January 1916.

INTRODUCTION

IRENÆUS is an influential but little-known personality of the Early Church. He was a good bishop and a great author. "No early Christian writer has deserved better of the whole Church than Irenæus," says Professor Swete.[1] He was a Greek of Smyrna, where he had been a pupil of Polycarp, to whom he refers in terms of affectionate regard, and whom he says he knew when "a mere boy." As Polycarp perished about 155 (Lightfoot, but Bury says in A.D. 166 ?), Irenæus must have been born about 137 [2] (Lipsius). It would seem that Irenæus was a pupil of Justin Martyr in Rome. During the persecution of Marcus (A.D. 166) he withdrew to Gaul, where he became the presbyter of the Church of Lugdunum (Eusebius) under Bishop Pothinus. After the martyrdom of the latter in 177, Irenæus, who had been on a mission to Rome and the East, was elected bishop on his return. The account of the sufferings of the Christians of Vienne and Lyons is recorded in the letter they sent to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia. This is preserved in the fifth book of Eusebius' history.

The difficulties he had to face as bishop were great.

[1] Preface to author's work *Irenæus of Lugdunum* (Cambridge Press).

[2] Lightfoot 120, Harvey 130, Zahn 115, all seem much too early, but see V. 30. 3, where he says, "John saw his vision almost in our own generation, towards the end of the reign of Domitian" (A.D. 96).

On the one hand there was the influence of bad men like Marcus the Gnostic, who led astray many Christian women in the district of the Rhone. On the other hand was the storm-cloud of persecution which still hung over the little Christian community in Gaul. But Irenæus was enabled by the grace of God to disarm the suspicions of the Roman government by his self-denying life and peaceful policy, and in his treatise against the heretics to disprove the subtle refinements and plausible arguments of the Gnostics.

Thus he succeeded in re-establishing the Church in the country. Early Church writers speak in a chorus of praise of him whom Theodoret described as " the Apostolic man who gave light to the West," " the admirable Irenæus who brought learning, culture and religion to the tribes of Gaul." During his residence among the Keltae, of whom he proved himself a true father in God, he had almost forgotten the use of Latin and Greek through using the native dialects.

In relation to the outside world he proved himself a worthy bishop of the Church. He intervened as peace-maker in the Paschal Controversy, and wrote a dignified letter of protest to Victor, Bishop of Rome, who was acting in a high-handed manner with the Quartodecimans. The principle he laid down, that " differences in such details confirm our concord in the faith," was quoted with approbation by the late Bishop Wordsworth (*Ministry of Grace*, p. 357).

Irenæus was the author of several works. He wrote books " on the Ogdoad," " on the Monarchy of God," " on Science," and one " to prove the Apostolic Preaching," which has been recently found in an Armenian translation. There are many fragments of his works; some of these, " the Pfaff fragments," are a *cause célèbre*.

He was not spared to write the special treatise

against Marcion which he promised, in order to confute him out of his own writings. This was done by Tertullian. But his *magnum opus* was the treatise against the heresies. Unfortunately, a great portion of his work is only extant in a rude but faithful Latin translation. A considerable part of the Greek can, however, be reconstructed from the numerous quotations in Hippolytus, his pupil, who carried on the war with the Gnostics, and in Epiphanius, who quotes the preface and most of the first book, and in Eusebius. The cumbersome Latin titles found in the treatise, such as "de detectione et eversione falsae cognitionis" (Praef. IV.), "de traductione et eversione falso cognominatae cognitionis" (Praef. I.), "adversus omnes haereticos detectio atque convictio" (I. 22. 1), etc., which represent attempts to translate the Greek title as given by Photius, λόγοι πέντε ἐλέγχου καὶ ἀνατροπῆς τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, were avoided by Church writers, who called the work briefly *Adversus Haereses* (Jerome), or *Contra Haereses,* or *Contra Haereticos.* The title of the Clermont MS. is *Contra Omnes Haereses;* of the Voss, *Contra Omnes Haereticos.* These and the Arundel are the chief MSS. Prof. Loofs ascribes the Clermont to the ninth century, the Arundel to the thirteenth, and the Vossian to the fourteenth. The Arundel was purchased in 1636 by Thomas Earl of Arundel, was presented in 1681 to the Royal Society, and since 1831 has been in the British Museum.

At the Reformation students of every religious party, Franciscans, Jesuits, Lutherans, Calvinists, studied this treatise for arguments. The controversy between the Lutherans and the Romans became so hot that Pfaff (1715) is said to have made use of some unauthentic fragments to support his case. The principal editions were by Erasmus (1526), Feuardent, Gallasius (with Greek text from Epiphanius), Grabe

(with Greek fragments published at Oxford 1702), Massuet (1710, reprinted by Migne 1857), Stieren (1853), and Harvey (Cambridge 1857), who gives a number of Syriac fragments found in the Nitrian collection in the British Museum. Mr. Harvey's theory is that there was a Syriac version of the treatise. The Armenian version of the "proof of the Apostolic Preaching" supports this theory.

This treatise is one of the most important remains of the Early Church. It undoubtedly owes its unique position to the loss of Justin's *Syntagma*, or treatise against all the heresies, and of Hegesippus' work on the Apostolic Kerygma in five books, on which it may have been modelled (Euseb., *H.E.*, iv. 8). Its composition extended over a number of years, and was undertaken at the request of a friend. It is not merely an exposure of the false tenets of the various Gnostic schools, but also an exposition of the true doctrine of the Church. In the first of the five books the Gnostic themes are described, in the second they are refuted, and in the three concluding books the Christian truth is set forth. The first two books of the treatise throw an important light upon early speculation, which was carried on beneath the cloak of Christianity and in the name of Gnosticism. To a certain extent they are not within the range of the ordinary reader, inasmuch as they discuss abstract speculations and bewildering sophistications. Gnosticism was a manifold scheme for the solution of all the problems that perplex us, viz. the origin of things, especially of evil, and the end of all things, especially of its professors, the relation of the finite and the infinite, creation, salvation and consummation. Its materials were equally manifold and heterogeneous, and extended from Pythagorean numbers to texts of Scripture, and embraced the Jewish Cabbala, oriental theosophy, Egyptian mythology, and Greek

philosophy. The promoters of this ancient "Christian Science," or medley, assumed an air of superiority over "common Church-people," and their organizations offered to the would-be clever persons an attractive refuge from the social service of the Church. Thus it became a great barrier to the progress of Christian thought among the cultured. The grains of truth in it gave life and strength to the miscellaneous mass of speculation, nonsense and mysticism of which it consisted. To expose and refute the plausible theories, rules of magic, and mystifying utterances of the many Gnostic sects, Irenæus, like another St. Paul, buckled on his armour.

It might be supposed that these grotesque speculations have little interest for readers now. But it is obvious that many of the grotesque speculations of modern times have a Gnostic source. The theories which Irenæus exposed remind us of the systems of Swedenborg, Mrs. Baker Eddy, Mrs. Annie Besant and others. Indeed, we might say in general that spiritualism [1] and its occultism, clairvoyance, hallucinations and "spirits," Swedenborgianism and its "correspondences," theosophy and its "planes," Christian Science and its "delusions," are but revivals of certain aspects of ancient Gnostic thought in Christian dress. The danger of these early systems, like those of modern ones, consisted not so much in the mass of error they concealed as in the grains of truth they contained. The principle that underlay Gnosticism, viz. that God is unknowable and altogether

[1] The *paredrus*, or attendant spirit of some Gnostic teachers by which they obtained an unholy influence over women, and virtually hypnotized them, is mentioned in I. 13. 2, I. 23. 3, I. 25. 2. In II. 31. 1 he speaks of their introducing demon spirits. He is even stronger in II. 31. 3, where he openly charges the Gnostics with intercourse with evil spirits. Cf. also II. 32. 3: "phantasmata ostendentes," showing apparitions (spooks).

transcendent, was founded to a great extent on the Platonic system in which the Demiurgos, or Creator, having finished his work, retires and leaves the world to be managed by secondary gods especially created for the purpose and by its own soul. In our days we have corrected the Platonic view of transcendence of Deity by the Aristotelian theory of Divine Immanence without identifying the Creator with His creation. But the natural instinct to shrink from the All-pure, All-powerful One, and to seek the intercession and guidance of intermediary deities, which is crystallized in the Roman system, in which the Father is approached through saints, angels, and the Blessed Virgin, was expressed in the Gnostic system. The Gnostics filled up the gap they had made between God and man by a scale of intermediaries, variously called æons, or emanations, and dynameis, or agencies.[1]

This was an attractive system for a certain inquiring type of mind. "The specious fraud of the heretics," writes Irenæus, "tricked out with borrowed plumes, might easily beguile the more simple to accept it as truth." For those who were of a highly imaginative cast of mind the Valentinian *gnosis* held out many inducements; to those of an ascetic and practical type the Marcionite *gnosis* appealed with greater force. It is not surprising that Gnosticism died hard, if it died at all. An *Eglise Gnostique*, apparently a revival of the Valentinian heresy, was until quite recently working in Paris and Lyons, and was frequented by a certain class of spiritualists. The reader can easily apply Irenæus' criticism of the Gnostics' use and mutilation of Scripture to the illegal use and interpretation of the Scriptures in the modern Gnostic systems of Swedenborg, Christian Science and modern Theosophy.

[1] This subject is treated at greater length in the writer's *Clement of Alexandria* (S.P.C.K.), pp. 150–179.

One advantage the Church reaped from her controversy with Gnosticism was that these heresies elicited vital definitions. The most important portion of the treatise is, accordingly, that which contains summaries of the Apostolic Creed and statements on the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation and Atonement. For a more detailed discussion of these points the reader is referred to the writer's *Irenæus of Lugdunum* (Cambridge Press). In this little book an attempt is made to present the continuous argument of the treatise with translations of the principal passages, as has been already done in the writer's edition of St. Augustine's *City of God* (S.P.C.K.). Footnotes have been added where necessary. Much has had to be omitted owing to the necessarily limited space at our disposal.

THE FIVE BOOKS OF
THE REFUTATION AND EXPOSURE OF THE FALSELY NAMED SCIENCE (GNOSIS)

By our Father Irenæus, Bishop of Lugdunum.

BOOK I

PREFACE. 'Certain people setting aside the truth introduce false words and *endless genealogies, which,* as the Apostle says, *minister* questions rather than godly edifying (1 Tim. i. 4), and by their craftily constructed systems lead astray and captive the minds of simple folk. Playing fast and loose with the Lord's own words, and proving themselves bad expounders of good sayings, they pervert many, seducing them by the offer of knowledge from Him who has established and adorned this universe, pretending that they can show something more exalted and important than the God who has made the heaven, the earth, and all things therein. Speciously inveigling the innocent by the cleverness of their words, they absurdly destroy them by causing them to think blasphemously and impiously of the Demiurge [1] (Creator), so that they are not able to distinguish the false from the true. For

[1] In the Gnostic systems the Creator, or Demiurge, is treated as an inferior god to Bythus. Irenæus argues that the Creator is superior to every thing and being in the universe.

their error is not displayed in its nakedness, in which case it would be exposed and discovered, but is tricked out cunningly with plausible adornment, and parades itself in its foreign finery as more truthful than the truth itself before the eyes of the inexperienced.[1] It has been said by one better [2] than ourselves with regard to such people, that a glass imitation mocks at the real genuine and highly prized emerald, when there is no one present who can test it and expose the counterfeit. For when the brass has been mixed with gold, it were hard for the innocent to discover it. Now in order that they, whom the Lord has put into our charge, may not be snatched away, as sheep deceived by the specious device of the sheep-skin, by wolves, even by those who say the same things but think differently, I deemed it necessary, since I have come across the commentaries of the very pupils of Valentinus, and have met some of them, and have studied their tenets, to make known to you, beloved,[3] the marvellous and profound mysteries, which all do not understand because all have not the brains,[4] in order that you, when you have studied them, may expose them to your people and warn them to avoid the depth of folly and the blasphemy against Christ.

[1] Compare the manner in which the Scriptures are used by the Christian Scientists and Swedenborgians and Theosophists, etc.

[2] Irenæus often quotes the words of some elder. At times he may refer to Polycarp, with whom he was connected in early youth; at others to Pothinus, his predecessor in Lyons. (See I. 12. 4.) Papias may be intended in some cases.

[3] Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus (?), known as Hippolytus Romanus, is meant. The basis of his work against the heresies, according to Photius, was the writings of his master Irenæus, the gaps in whose treatise may be filled up occasionally by Hippolytus' quotations.

[4] Ironical. Cf. the appeal to occult lore by the Theosophists.

'As far as I can, I shall give a concise and clear account of the opinions of the followers of Ptolemaus, an offshoot of the Valentinian school, and shall help you in my humble way to overthrow it, by showing that their teaching is monstrous and opposed to the truth. I have had no practice in writing books, nor training in the art of composition; but my love urges me to reveal to you and your people teachings that have been kept dark until this present, but have now, in the grace of God, been made manifest. "*For there is nothing hidden which shall* not be revealed, and secret which shall not be known" (Matt. x. 26).

'You will not require from me who am domiciled among Celts, and almost always use their barbarous dialect, elaborate language which I have not studied, nor skill in composition which I have not practised, nor graceful style and persuasive diction of which I am not a master. But you will with love receive words written with love, but simply, truthfully, plainly. You will be able to expand them, being better qualified than I am, using them as seeds of thought and principles. And with your widely read and trained intelligence you will develop my condensed notes, and what I have weakly described, you will be able to present with force to your people. And the same zeal that I have shown in not only telling you of these opinions, which you have long desired to know, but in supplying you with the material to controvert them, will be displayed, I am sure, by you in your service to others according to the grace given unto you by the Lord, with the result that our people will no more be drawn away by their plausible doctrine.'[1]

[1] Hippolytus fulfilled the expectations of his master. Photius (*Cod.* 121) describes Hippolytus' work against all heresies as a small book against thirty-two heresies; as an abstract from the writings of Irenæus, and as written in a

[The first of the five books consists principally of an explanation of the views of the Valentinian school of Gnostics. Their system was the most popular and imaginative. Starting with the idea that matter was evil, and that, therefore, the Father, the supreme Unknown and transcendent Deity, who is described as Bythus, Proarche, or Propator, had no part in the creation, these Gnostics filled up the void with a graduated scale of intermediaries, acting in pairs, and divided into groups of ogdoads, decads, and dodecads, which they called agencies or æons or emanations. These were all produced from the Supreme God, collectively made up the number thirty, and constituted the Pleroma. This system, Irenæus declares, was borrowed from Pythagoras, Plato, Democritus, and the comic poets of Greece, Antiphanes and others. It was also based, to a large extent, upon the three Egyptian enneads or cycles of Gods in which Deity was supposed to manifest Itself. The Supreme God of the Gnostics became identified with the Pleroma or fullness, which consisted of a number of created divinities. The most important of these is Nous or Monogenes, who alone has knowledge of the Supreme God, and who leads others to that knowledge. From Bythus (depth) and Sige (silence), also called Ennoia (thought) and Charis (grace), are produced Nous (intellect) or Monogenes (only-begotten) and Aletheia (truth). From the second pair, or Syzygy, are generated Logos (word) and Zoe (life), and from these Anthropos (man) and Ecclesia (church). This was the first cycle, and was called the Ogdoad or the Octave. Then from Logos and Zoe are produced five pairs called the Decad,

---

clear and dignified style. The late Dr. Salmon believed that Hippolytus may have heard Irenæus lecture in Rome, where Irenæus himself had been a pupil of Justin, whose *Syntagma* was frequently used by him.

the second cycle; and from Anthropos and Ecclesia six pairs called the Dodecad, the third cycle. All these together make up the Pleroma and the number thirty. A solitary æon called Stauros (cross) or Horos (boundary) is employed in keeping each æon in its place. Of this æon Neander (*Church History*, II. 73) remarks: "It is a profound idea of the Valentinian system that as all existence has its ground in the self-limitation of Bythus, so the existence of all created beings depends on limitation."

Horos, the boundary, is also called Redeemer and Saviour in this system. It is also the cross separating, and is said to be described in the text, "I am not come to bring peace but a sword" (Matt. x. 34). The "fan in the hand" (Luke iii. 17) referred to the cross which consumes all material things and cleanses those who are saved. But the cross supporting and sustaining is said to be alluded to in the passage, "Whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple" (Luke xiv. 27). The services of Horos were requisitioned for Sophia, the last of the æons, who in her eagerness to see the light of the Supreme God, which could only be seen with safety by the first mystery, moved out of the Pleroma into the "void" and was brought back by Horos. But from her wanderings outside the Pleroma the world and mankind originated. For the fall of the errant æon into matter resulted in the quickening of a shapeless thing called Achamoth (Hebrew, *ḥokhmoth*, plural of *ḥokhmah*, wisdom, the second of the Hebrew Sephiroth). This was shut into outer darkness.

In the meantime two new æons, Christ and the Holy Spirit, were formed by Nous. The æon Christ taught the others to rest content with the knowledge that Bythus was unknowable, and the Holy Spirit made them unite in glorifying this great Being. In

gratitude for the restoration of harmony, disturbed by the vagaries of Sophia, each of the thirty æons contributed something to the formation of another æon, Jesus or Soter—"the flower of the Pleroma,[1] for in him dwelleth all the fullness (or Pleroma) of the Godhead" (Col. ii. 9; *Adv. Haer.* i. 3. 4). Seeing and pitying the struggles of Achamoth to reach the light, Christ touched her with his Cross and she became the soul of the world, receiving from him the form of being, though not of knowledge. And from her struggles to reach the light were produced psychic existences, the Demiurge among them. And from her grief and tears at failure came material things, among them Satan and his angels. But Achamoth turned again to supplicate Christ, who, unwilling to leave the Pleroma a second time, sent her the Paraclete, or the Saviour, with a host of angels, the Father having given all things into his hands. Jesus gave her shape, which is according to knowledge, and from their union proceeded spiritual or pneumatic existence. The immediate work of the creation of the world was performed by the Demiurge, the Creator, who by one class, the Alexandrians, was regarded as the unconscious instrument of the Father, but by another —the Syrian Gnostics—as the inveterate foe of the Supreme God. All Gnostics regarded him, however, and not the Supreme God, as the creator of the world. The names under which he appears are as mysterious as the accounts of his origin are perplexing. He is described as "the offspring of ignorance" and the "fruit of a defect." Inferior to the Supreme God, the Propator or Bythus, but superior to the existing matter, a third principle (ὕλη), the corporeal elements of which sprang from the bewilderment of Achamoth, he fashions the latter into shape, bringing it out of chaos into cosmos. The Demiurge belongs to the

[1] This text figures prominently in the system of Swedenborg.

middle class—the psychical, and consequently is ignorant of the Spiritual being who is above him. By separating the psychical from the material he makes the seven heavens, each of which is under the control of an angel. He then makes man, bestowing upon him a psychic soul and body. Achamoth, however, succeeded in imparting to man a spiritual germ, or spark, which made him superior to his maker. Envious of this, the Demiurge thrust man down to the earth, and in the course of time he instructed the Jewish prophets to proclaim him as Jehovah. But by reason of the spiritual germ they had they also uttered prophecies inspired by a higher source (I. 7. 3). He also created a Messiah, of a psychic soul and immaterial body, to which was added a pneumatic soul from a higher source. This lower Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, passing through her as water through a tube. In his thirtieth year, a year that corresponded with the number of the æons, the æon Jesus descended upon him at his Baptism. To him the Demiurge, on learning his mission, gladly yielded, and in the form of a centurion said: "For I also am a man under authority, having soldiers under me" (I. 7. 4; Luke vii. 8). But it was not possible for the æon Jesus to suffer. Therefore the æon Jesus and the spiritual soul abandoned the "lower" Christ when he was brought before Pilate, but the psychic Christ suffered, in order that the "mother" might display him as a type of the "higher" Christ who was extended upon the Stauros, or Cross, and who gave Achamoth substantial form. "For all these things are types of those." This travesty of the Christian faith is set forth in the first chapters of the first book of the treatise.

With regard to Soteriology or doctrine of salvation, Valentinian admitted a certain redemption, but held that while faith was necessary for the psychical class,

and miracles were required to produce it, the pneumatic or spiritual were above such help, and no matter what their actions might be (I. 6. 2) were saved by knowledge or *gnosis* alone, being admitted to the "wisdom of the perfect." But there was no salvation whatever for the material class. "The psychical class needs training through the senses. They say that the Saviour took the firstfruits of those he would save. From Achamoth he assumed the spiritual; from the Demiurge he received the psychical Christ; and from the constitution (or dispensation) he took a psychical body which could be seen and touched. But there was nothing material in it, because matter could not be saved" (I. 6. 1). "The psychical class, that is, men who are confirmed by works and faith, and have not perfect knowledge, are educated in psychical matters. They say that we of the Church belong to this class, and that in our case a good life is necessary to salvation. But they are completely saved not by their works, but through their being spiritual by nature, and cannot see corruption, *no matter what things they do*" (I. 6. 2). At the same time the Gnostics used certain means of purification, as a means of deliverance of the spark of life from matter. There were a series of mysteries in which Baptism and the Eucharist had the first place, and also ascetic practices and a form of renunciation described by Irenæus in I. 21. 3. It is also found in the *Pistis Sophia*.

The consummation was that finally all spiritual creatures deprived of their souls should be restored to their original state, and reaching the flower of their perfection should be united with their angelic partners in the Pleroma (I. 7. 1 and 5). The Demiurge was to leave his heaven for the middle region, where he should reign over the psychic righteous. The æon Jesus, the Bridegroom, was to be united with his

bride, Sophia or Achamoth, and the world and all that was material should be consumed by the fire that lurks within it (I. 7. 1).

The number three played an important part in the Gnostic theosophy, cosmology and psychology. There were three elements in their theosophy, matter, Demiurge and Bythus; three episodes in the history of religion, heathenism, Judaism and Christianity; and three divisions of mankind, the earthly, the psychical and the spiritual, like Cain, Abel, Seth (I. 7. 5). In the prologue of the Fourth Gospel they found three principles: God, Beginning and Word (I. 8. 5). The Pleroma is divided into three parts: the ogdoad, the decad and dodecad (I. 1. 3).]

We shall now proceed to the translation of principal passages—

I. 1. 1. 'They say that there is a certain æon in the invisible and ineffable heights, who is pre-existent and perfect. Him they call Proarche, Propator and Bythus. He is incomprehensible, invisible, without beginning or end, and uncreated.'

I. 2. 1. 'The Propator can only be known by Monogenes or Nous, who delights in contemplating his greatness.'

I. 2. 5. 'The (æon) Christ instructed the thirty æons on the subject of their unions. But with regard to the knowledge of the Father he announced to them that He is incomprehensible and uncontainable, and that it is not possible to see or hear Him, save through Monogenes. And the cause of their eternal endurance is this incomprehensible nature of the Father.'

I. 3. 1. 'They say that Paul frequently made distinct mention of the æons, saying, "unto all the generations of the ages of the age."' [1]

[1] Eph. iii. 21. *τῶν αἰώνων τοῦ αἰῶνος* (*αἰών*, or æon, literally means an age, but was used to signify an emanation in

I. 3. 4. 'And this is clearly stated by Paul, "And He Himself is all things." [1] And again, "All things are unto Him and from Him are all things." [2] And again, "in Him dwelleth all the fullness (*pleroma*) of the Godhead." [3] And "to sum up all things in Christ." '[4]

I. 3. 6. 'Such things they say about their Pleroma and the creation of the universe, in their endeavours to make the things that have been well said suit their evil conceptions. Not only do they try to get their proofs from the evangelical and apostolical writings, but also from the law and the prophets,[5] perverting the interpretations and dealing recklessly with the explanations, although many things are said in parables and allegories. Thus they are able to give a forced and false rendering of ambiguous statements, adapting them craftily to their own system. And so they lead captive from the truth those who have not a firm faith in one God the Father Almighty and in one Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God.' [6]

I. 4. 3. 'Herein is a subject for tragedy when one man expounds pompously in one way, and another in another way, from what passion and from what element material substance had its origin. As one might expect, they do not seem to be willing to teach every one openly about such things, but only those who are able to pay high fees for such wonderful secrets. For they do not teach anything like these things concerning which our Lord said "freely ye have received,

---

the Gnostic system). The order of these words in the N.T. is different.

[1] Col. iii. 11.

[2] Rom. xi. 36. The Greek is "from Him and through Him and unto Him are all things."

[3] Col. ii. 9. [4] Eph. i. 10.

[5] Notice the fourfold division of Scripture.

[6] This Eastern form of the Creed was devised to meet Gnostic errors.

freely give" (Matt. x. 8), but abstruse, prodigious, and profound mysteries discovered with much labour by those who love deceit. For who would not spend all he had to learn that from the tears of Enthymesis, the suffering æon, seas and springs and rivers and all the watery element had their source, and that from its laughter the light, and from its fear and uncertainty the material elements of the world arose?'[1]

I. 6. 2. 'As gold does not lose its beauty and nature when buried in the mud, since the mud cannot injure the gold, even so they declare that, no matter what material actions they do, such cannot hurt them nor deprive them of their spiritual nature.

I. 6. 3. 'Wherefore their "perfect" ones do all the forbidden things without hesitation, although the Scriptures say that those "who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. v. 21). I. 6. 4. And although they do many abominable and impious deeds they run us down, who, having the fear of God are on guard against sinning in thought and word, as "idiots"[2] and "know-nothings." They exalt themselves, calling themselves "perfect" and "seeds of the election." We, they say, have grace only for our use, and therefore it will be taken away, but they have it as their own possession[3] from above from the unspeakable conjunction.'

I. 7. 5. 'Such, then, is their system, which the prophets did not announce, our Lord did not teach, and the Apostles did not hand down;[4] but which they

[1] A specimen of Irenæus' irony.

[2] The Greek *ἰδιώτης* passed through many phases. At first it meant a private individual, then an amateur as opposed to a professional, then a plebeian, then an ignorant person.

[3] This contrast in Latin would be expressed by *usu* and *mancipio*. Cf. Lucr. III. 971. Vitaque mancipio nulli datur omnibus *usu*.

[4] Reference to Apostolic *tradition*.

boastfully declare that they understand better than others, reading it in the *Agrapha*.[1] And, as the saying is, they attempt to make ropes out of sand in applying the parables of our Lord, or prophetic utterances, or Apostolic statements to their plausible scheme, in order that they may have foundation for it. But they alter the scriptural context and connection, and dismember the truth, as much as they can. By their perversions and changes, and by making one thing out of another, they deceive many with their specious adaptations of the oracles of the Lord. It is just as if there was a beautiful representation of a king made in a mosaic by a skilled artist, and one altered the arrangement of the pieces of stone into the shape of a dog or fox, and then should assert that this was the original representation of a king. In much the same manner they stitch together old wives' fables, and wresting sayings and parables, however they may, from the context, attempt to fit the oracles of God into their myths.'

I. 9. 1. 'Their perverted method of interpretation is quite apparent. For though John declared that there was one God Almighty, and one only-begotten [2] Christ Jesus, through whom all things were made, and that he was the Word of God, that he was Monogenes, that he was the creator of all things, that he was the true light that giveth light to every man, that he was the creator of the world, that he came to his own, that he was made flesh, and tabernacled among us, yet these people, wresting the interpretation in their plausible way, say that *Monogenes* whom they call *Arche* is one, Soter is another, Logos son of Monogenes is a third, and Christ is a fourth, so

[1] Writings without authority of Scripture. Cf. the use made by Mrs. Baker Eddy of the Scriptures and of Quimby's revelations in her *Key to the Scriptures*.

[2] Monogenes.

that, according to them, John [1] made no mention of Jesus Christ.'

I. 9. 3. 'This whole system in which they make light of the Scriptures and wrest them to their purpose has fallen through like an unsubstantial dream. For, as we have said, they collect words and sayings at haphazard, and give them an unnatural and unreal connection. Just like those who propose any chance subject for verse, and then attempt to declaim passages taken from the poems of Homer in such a way that the illiterate imagine that they have composed the Homeric verses on the spur of the moment upon the given theme.[2] . . . What simple soul would not be carried away by such compositions and imagine that it was really Homer? But any one who knew Homer would recognize the verses, but would not accept the story. In the same way he who has that rule of truth [3] steadfast in himself, which he had

[1] Irenæus speaks of Christ as the teacher of John, and of John as the Apostle.

[2] As an instance of this sort of cento imitated by the Gnostics, Irenæus cites the following verses on Hercules, composed of different portions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*—

> "With these words he dismissed the lamenting
> Hercules, hero for great valour famed,
> Did Eurysteus, proud Perseus' descendant,
> To bring from Erebus grim Pluto's dog.
> Like some fell lion from the hills he rushed
> Straight through the city, his friends behind him,
> Young men and maidens and elders toil-worn
> Mourned for him as one that dashed on his doom."

[3] Canon of truth received in baptism is the Creed, which was used in baptism from the first. Irenæus calls it the canon of truth, *canon* (κανών) meaning "builder's rule," an idea which Irenæus had in his mind here. Other names are "the truth preached by the Church," "the preaching of truth," "the ancient tradition," "the tradition," "the regula veritatis," "praedicatio Apostolica" (Origen), "the symbolum" (Cyprian). "Kerygma (κήρυγμα) of the truth" is a favourite term with Irenæus.

received at his baptism, will recognize the scriptural names, quotations and parables, but will not accept their blasphemous system as scriptural. For even though he may know the stories, he will not take the fox's portrait for the king's. But referring each quotation to its own context, and its own place in the body of the truth, he will expose and refute their theory. But since the ending is wanting to this drama, so that any one at the conclusion of the mime may introduce the destructive argument,[1] we thought it well to show first of all how the authors of this farce differ with one another, manifesting different spirits of error. For from this one can shrewdly understand, even before demonstration, that the truth proclaimed by the Church is pure, but their invention is false.'

[Here follows a noble statement of the Christian faith, on which the Nicene Creed was founded.[2]]

I. 10. 1. 'The Church, although scattered over the whole world even to its extremities, received from the Apostles and their disciples the faith in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, the seas and all that in them is, and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation, and in the Holy Ghost, who by the prophets proclaimed the dispensations, the advents, the virgin birth, the passion and resurrection from the dead, the bodily ascension of the well-beloved Christ Jesus our Lord into heaven, and his Parousia (Advent) from the heavens in the glory of the Father to gather

[1] A difficult passage, the words being used in a technical sense. ἀπολύτρωσις may be the *dénouement* of a plot. He means that it will be time enough to refute their opinion when he has exposed them.

[2] This is one of the many summaries of the faith found in the treatise. See also I. 22. 1; II. 30. 9; II. 35. 4; III. 4. 2; IV. 33. 7.

up all things in Himself and to raise the flesh of all mankind to life, in order that *everything in heaven and in earth and under the earth should bow the knee* (Phil. ii. 10f.) to Christ Jesus our Lord and God, our Saviour and our King, according to the will of the invisible Father, and that every tongue should *confess* [1] to him, and that he should pronounce a just judgment upon all, and dismiss the spirits of wickedness and the angels who transgressed and became apostate, and the ungodly, unrighteous, lawless and profane into everlasting fire, but in his graciousness should confer life and the reward of incorruption and eternal glory upon those who have kept his commandments and have abided in his love either from the beginning of their life or since their repentance.'

I. 10. 2. 'This Kerygma [2] and this faith the Church, although scattered over the whole world, diligently observes, as if it occupied but one house, and believes as if it had but one mind, and preaches and teaches as if it had but one mouth. And although there are many dialects in the world, the meaning of the tradition is one and the same.'

[Unanimity in the Church.]

'For the same faith is held and handed down by the Churches established in the Germanies, the Spains, among the Celtic tribes, in the East, in Libya, and in the central portions of the world. But as the sun, the creation of God, is one and the same in all the world, so is the light of the Kerygma of the truth

[1] Phil. ii. 10, 11. Notice *confiteatur ei* is also read by St. Patrick (*Confession* 4) in his summary of the Creed, which resembles this form in many points, and like it has this passage inserted among the articles of belief.

[2] κήρυγμα corresponds to preaching, in passive sense; lit. preachment, thing preached. κηρύσσω means to proclaim, herald, preach.

which shines on all who desire to come to the knowledge of the truth. Not even the most able of the leaders [1] in the Churches will say anything different from this. Nor will the feeblest say less. For the faith is one and the same.'

I. 10. 3. 'The fact that some have a greater understanding of the faith than others is not shown by their altering the substance of it, and inventing another God besides the Creator and Maker and Nourisher of this universe, or another Christ, or another Only-Begotten (like the Gnostics). Such may throw light upon the obscurities of the parables, and point out their application to the scheme of faith. They may explain the Divine system and dispensation for man's salvation, and His long-suffering in the apostasy of the angels, and in regard to the disobedience of man. They may show why one and the same God made some things temporal and other things eternal—these heavenly and those earthly. They may understand why God, although invisible, manifested Himself in different ways to different people. They may teach the reasons why there has been more than one covenant for mankind and what is the character of each; explain why God included all in unbelief; and thankfully say why the Word of God became flesh and suffered, and why the Parousia of the Son of God took place in these last times, that is, why the beginning appeared at the end. They may also unfold all that the Scriptures contain regarding the end of the world and the things to come. They need not be silent as to why it is that God hath made the Gentiles, whose salvation was beyond hope, fellow-heirs, members of the same body, and of the fellowship of the saints. They may ex-

[1] οἱ προεστῶτες; cf. Justin, *Apol.* I. 65. τῷ προεστῶτι, the presiding elder. There was no esoteric teaching in the Church as there was among the Gnostic sects.

pound in their discourses the meaning of the words, "This mortal body [1] shall put on immortality, and this corruptible shall put on incorruption," and they may say in what senses He says, "They who are not a people, a people; and she who is not beloved, beloved;" [2] and "the children of the desolate are more than the children of the married wife." [3] But they do not exercise their ingenuity in discovering their Mother and the Enthymesis (thought) of the wandering æon superior to the Creator and Maker; nor in inventing the Pleroma which is superior to her, and now the thirty and anon an innumerable number of æons, like these teachers who are truly devoid of divine understanding. For the whole Church which is throughout the whole world possesses one and the same faith.'

[Irenæus proceeds to show that, in contrast to this unanimity in the Church, the Gnostics do not agree among themselves.]

I. II. 1. 'For few as they are, they differ among themselves in their treatment of the same points, and in regard to the things they describe and the names they employ, are at variance with one another. The chief [4] of the founders of the Gnostic heresy to adopt with success these principles in the system of his school was Valentinus.'

[After a brief mention of the tenets of Valentinus' school, which have already been set forth in this book, he discusses the tenets of Secundus and of another, Epiphanes (Latin, *Clarus*), regarding their

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 54. Irenæus adds σαρκίον to the text, and reverses the order of the clauses.

[2] Hos. i. 9, ii. 23; Rom. ix. 25; 1 Pet. ii. 10.

[3] Isa. liv. 1.

[4] Ignatius, in a letter to the Magnesians, refers to the Gnostic emanations of Logos from Sige. It appears, then, that the Gnostic heresy was very much older than Valentinus.

first principles, "Proanennoetos," the Pre-unthinkable, etc., which he criticizes with mild ridicule.]

I. 11. 4. 'One may, in such an argument, employ the following names. There is, for example, a certain royal "Pro-beginning," "Pro-unthinkable," "Pro-substantial," "Pro-revolving power." With this is a certain power which I call the "gourd." With this "gourd" is a power which I call the "void." This "gourd" and this "void," though they are one, have sent forth, although they did not send forth, fruit visible to all, eatable and sweet, which fruit we call "cucumber." With this "cucumber" is a certain power which I call "pumpkin." These powers, the "gourd" and the "void," the "cucumber" and the "pumpkin," sent forth the numerous remainder of Valentinus' absurd pumpkins.

'If they can use any names they like for their quaternion, why should not one use names like these which are much more respectable and in common use?'

[Irenæus proceeds to describe the opinions of Ptolemæus, a pupil of Valentinus.]

I. 12. 1. 'Do they not seem, my dear friend, to have before their minds the Homeric Zeus who did not sleep for his anxiety to honour Achilles and destroy many Greeks, rather than the Lord of the universe, who as soon as He has thought, has accomplished what He thought; and as soon as He has willed, has conceived what He willed, being altogether thought, altogether will, altogether mind, altogether sight, altogether hearing, altogether the source of everything that is good?'

[In the course of his account of Marcus, a clever impostor and charlatan, he describes his method of initiating women into these mysteries.]

I. 13. 2. 'Pretending to consecrate [1] mixed [2] cups of wine, and extending to a great length the words of invocation, he makes it appear purple and red, so that it seems as if the grace, that is over all, distilled its blood into that cup at his invocation. And the people present vehemently desired to taste of that cup, in order that the grace invoked by this magician might shed upon them the dew of its blessing.'

I. 13. 3. 'As my superior said about such women, "a bold and a shameless thing is a soul, heated and puffed with mere air."'

[Here follows an account of the plausible way in which this Marcus led away silly women [3] to join him and his sect, persuading them, like certain modern impostors, into believing that they could prophecy, and that they were filled with grace by reason of his invocations. Marcus and his followers seduced many women under the cloak of religion after exciting and inflating them with their nonsensical ideas. Irenæus quotes certain of their blasphemous incantations.]

I. 13. 7. 'By saying and doing such things in the district of the Rhine, they have deceived many women whose conscience was branded with a hot iron. Some of these made public confession, others were filled with shame, and despairing of the godly life lived as abandoned wretches, while others remained undecided, being, as the proverb says, "neither within nor without."'

[In the next chapter Irenæus shows how the

[1] εὐχαριστεῖν, in the sense of "consecrate." The Latin translation, *gratias agere*, is wrong. The word is used with active force, as in Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, etc.

[2] In the early Church the wine was mixed with water at the Eucharist. See Justin Martyr's account, *Apol.* I. 66.

[3] See 2 Tim. iii. 6. This was true of all sects since the Apostolic age, when Simon Magus had his Helene, and Montanus his Prisca and Maximilla (so Jerome).

Marcosians tried to establish their theory on numbers, syllables and letters. The name Jesus was called a symbolical (ἐπίσημον) name consisting of six letters. As Harvey points out, this name was *episemon* not because it consisted of six letters, but because its letters made up a symbolical number, *e. g.* 10+8+200 +70+400+200=888 (I. 15. 2). The number seven had also great importance attached to it by these people. They treated *Christus* as containing eight letters, writing it χρειστός (I. 15. 2).]

I. 15. 4. 'These absurdities are beyond such exclamations as "alas," and every exclamation in tragedy. For who would not loathe the evil inventor of such falsehoods, seeing the truth turned into an idol (image) by Marcus, and, moreover, covered with the letters of the alphabet. The Greeks affirm that they received from Cadmus sixteen letters, recently, as compared with the high antiquity of "yesterday and before." Afterwards, in the course of time, the aspirated and the double letters were invented. Lastly, they say that Palamedes introduced the long letters.'

I. 15. 6. 'Again, who would put up with the way you confine the Creator of the universe and the creative Word of God in forms and numbers, sometimes thirty, sometimes twenty-four, sometimes six, cutting him up into four syllables and thirty elements and reducing the Lord of all, who established the heavens, like the alphabet, to the number 888? And of Him, whom you describe as incorporeal and unsubstantial, you compose the substance and form out of many letters, like a second Dædalus in your inventions. And that which you say is indivisible substance you divide into "mutes," "vowels" and "semi-vowels," falsely attributing the "mute" to the All-Father and His thought.'

I. 15. 6. 'Wherefore the divine elder and herald of the truth has aptly composed the following verses upon this folly of thine—

"Marcus of idols and portents the slave,
Of magic and stars ne'er ceasing to rave,
Seeking therein supports for thy error,
Compassing signs for victims of terror,
Essays in arts that lead men astray,
Taught thee by Satan whom thou dost obey,
Helped by Azazel, of goodness the foe,
Who findeth in thee his herald of woe."

'Such is the composition of the elder [1] beloved of God.'

[He then proceeds to describe their explanation of the parables and their system of letters and numbers.]

I. 16. 3. 'I know, my beloved, that you will laugh greatly at this absurd folly. But they are worthy of pity who endeavour to explain in this frigid and forcible way by Alpha and Beta and numbers so wonderful a divinity, and the magnitude of a truly ineffable virtue, and such mighty dispensations of God. But all who abandon the Church, and believe such old wives' fables, are truly self-condemned. These Paul bids us avoid after a first and second warning (Titus iii. 10). And John, the disciple of the Lord, extended their damnation, forbidding us to wish them "Good-day" (2 John 11).'

[In the following chapters he describes the astronomical views of the Marcosians. He shows how they interpret the things of the Mosaic law, such as the tabernacle, the high priest's breastplate, etc., according to their theory.]

I. 19. 1. 'I deemed it necessary to add to this all they attempt to prove about their Propator from the

[1] Most probably Pothinus, the predecessor of Irenæus in the see of Lugdunum.

Scriptures in order to show that our Lord announced a different Father from the Creator of the universe.'

I. 20. 1. 'In addition to this they introduce an untold number of apocryphal and fictitious Scriptures, which they have composed, to confound the simple and those who do not know the words of truth. They also add the absurd story[1] that when our Lord was a boy and was learning the alphabet, and the teacher said, "Say Alpha," he answered, "Alpha." But again when the master ordered him to say "Beta," the Lord answered, "Do you tell me first what is Alpha and then I shall tell you what is Beta."[2] This they explain as if he alone knew the mystery which he revealed in the type of the Alpha.'

I. 21. 1. 'Their plan of redemption is neither simple nor settled. For there are just as many schemes of redemption as there are teachers of this heresy. They deny the baptism of the regeneration into God.[3] But they say that it is necessary for those who have received the perfect gnosis to be regenerated (baptized) into the supreme power. For otherwise they could not enter the Pleroma. But they regard the baptism of the phenomenal[4] Jesus as for the remission of sins, but the redemption of the Christ, who descended upon him, as leading to perfection; and the one they call "psychical" and the other "spiritual." And the baptism was preached by John for the remission of sins, but the redemption was carried to perfection by the Christ in Jesus. And this is what he

[1] This story is in the Arabic Gospel of the infancy, and in the false Gospel of St. Thomas.

[2] Alphabet is taken from these two first letters of the Greek alphabet.

[3] *i. e.* baptismal regeneration, *ἀναγέννησις*; cf. Titus ii. 5, *διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας*; cf. 1 Pet. i. 3, *ἀναγεννήσας*.

[4] Opposed to real as in Hegel's philosophy. He proceeds to show that the Gnostics altered the form of Holy Baptism, and denied its spiritual efficacy in the Church's and the New Testament sense.

meant when he said: "I have another baptism to be baptized with and I hasten unto it" (Luke xii. 50), and to the sons of Zebedee he said, "Can you be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" And they say that Paul frequently referred to this redemption in Christ Jesus.'

I. 21. 3. 'Some prepare a marriage couch and go through a mystical performance, pronouncing strange formulæ over those who are being initiated, and declare that it is a spiritual marriage after the manner of the heavenly unions. Others lead them to the water and baptize them, pronouncing over them the words: "Into the name of the unknown Father of all things, into truth, the Mother of all things, into Him who descended upon Jesus, into union and redemption and communion with the powers." Others, with a view to bewilder the neophytes, repeat some Hebrew names, Basema, Camosse,[1] etc. Others declare the redemption thus: "The Name which is hidden from every deity and dominion and truth, with which Jesus of Nazareth was arrayed in the lives of the light, even of Christ our Lord, who lives through the Holy Spirit for angelic redemption." The name that renews them is Messia Ufar,[2] etc., which is pronounced by the consecrating minister while the consecrated one says, "I am confirmed and redeemed, I redeem my soul from this age and from all things connected with it in the name of Iao, who redeemed his soul for redemption in the living Christ." Then they anoint the initiated with balsam, for they regard the ointment as a type of the sweet odour which is over the universe.'

[1] These words in present form are unintelligible. It is probable that the original may have been in Syriac. Quite possible it was intended to bewilder not to edify.

[2] Harvey suggests that this was originally written in Syriac.

I. 21. 4. 'There are some, however, who say it is superfluous to bring people to the water. They mix oil with water, and put this mixture upon the heads of those who are to receive the rites of initiation with some of the expressions already mentioned. This they maintain is the redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις). They also anoint him with balsam. Others, however, object to all such ritual, asserting that the mystery of the unspeakable and invisible power should not be performed by visible and corruptible creatures. They hold that the full knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) of the ineffable power itself constitutes perfect redemption. By knowledge (γνῶσις) the condition which arises from ignorance is dissolved, so that gnosis is the redemption of the inner man. Others again redeem the dying,[1] even to the hour of death, putting oil and water upon their heads or the above-mentioned ointment with water and the said invocations.'

I. 22. 1. 'The rule (regula = κανών) of truth we hold is, that there is one God Almighty, who made all things by His Word, and fashioned and formed that which has existence out of that which had none. As the Scripture saith, "By the Word of the Lord and by the Spirit[2] of His mouth were the heavens and all their glory established." And again, "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made."[3] There is no exception; but the Father made all things by Him, both visible and invisible, objects of sense and intelligence, temporal, eternal and everlasting. And such He did not make

[1] "Mortuos." Grabe remarks that this is said of the dying, not of the dead. However, the dead may be meant. By the Council of Carthage (III. Can. 6) it was forbidden to give the Eucharist to the dead.

[2] Ps. xxxiii. 6. The same Hebrew word, *ruaḥ*, for Spirit and breath; cf. πνεῦμα, also "spiritus."

[3] John i. 3. Notice omission of "that was made" (ὃ γέγονεν), see I. 8. 5. So also Clement, Origen, Tertullian, Augustine.

by angels or by any powers separated from His thought. For God needs nought of such things; but it is He who by His Word and Spirit makes, disposes, governs and gives being to all things, who created the universe, who is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Above Him there is no other God, neither initial principle, nor power, nor pleroma. He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Following this rule we shall easily show that the heretics, in spite of their many and various assertions, have erred from the truth. For almost all the heresies that have been admit the one God but introduce innovations into this belief. They despise the work of God and deny their own salvation. They shall rise from the dead, that they may acknowledge the power of him who raises man from the dead. But they shall not be reckoned among the righteous because of their unbelief. The *confutation and exposure of all the heretics* [1] is a work of a manifold and intricate nature.'

[In the next chapter there is an account of Simon of Samaria [2] and Helena. Irenæus says that Simon was honoured with a statue on account of his magic art by Claudius Cæsar,[3] and describes his magical tricks, accompanying demons (*paredri*), the pretended reincarnations [4] of himself and his mistress, and his theory that morality is a matter of circumstance, not nature. Accounts of other heretics, Menander, Saturninus (Syrian), Basilides [5] (Alexandrian), Carpocrates,

[1] "Adversus omnes haereticos detectio atque convictio," one of the many titles of this book.

[2] Acts viii. 9–11.

[3] Irenæus follows Justin's account, *Apol.* I. 26. He confused this Simon and Semo Sancus, a Sabine deity.

[4] Theosophists argue that the Baptist was a reincarnation of Elijah.

[5] A fuller account of these Gnostics is given in the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria (see *Clement of Alexandria*, ch. v. (S.P.C.K.), by present writer).

Cerinthus, the Ebionites, Marcion, and other sects, the Barbeliotae, Naassenes, the cabbalistic heresy of the Ophites follow.]

I. 25. 2. 'These (Carpocratians) employ magical arts, love-philtres, attendant spirits,[1] saying that they have power to govern the rulers and makers of this world, and all things therein. Indeed, they have been sent forward by Satan to bring a slur upon the divine name of the Church, in order that their hearers may turn their ears from the preaching of the truth, and seeing their deeds may abuse us who have no communications with them in doctrine, morality, or daily conversation. And they have reached such an unbridled stage of insanity that they say they can do anything they like, no matter whether it be impious or impure, as morality is nothing but a matter of opinion. They also believe in transmigration of souls,[2] which will not cease until one has done every action, as one is bound to do by this system.'

I. 25. 5. 'By faith and love, they say, we are saved. Everything else is a matter of indifference, and opinion, since nothing is naturally bad. Certain of them brand their disciples in the right ear. Marcellina, who came to Rome in the time of Anicetus,[3] was one of these. She led many astray. They call themselves Gnostics. They have some images, some painted, others in a different material, which they say are representations of Christ made by Pilate in the time of Jesus. They crown these with garlands and place them among the busts of the philosophers, such as Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle.'

[1] Cf. the modern Spiritualists and their tricks at their séances.

[2] Neander compared this system to Buddhism. It was a form of Pantheism without morality.

[3] Bishop of Rome (157–168).

I. 26. 1. 'The Ebionites hold the same views of our Lord as Cerinthus.[1] They only use the Gospel according to Matthew, and reject the Apostle Paul, saying that he was an apostate from the law. The prophetic portions they expound in a peculiar way. They practise circumcision and follow Jewish customs, and venerate Jerusalem as the house of God.'

I. 27. 1. 'Cerdon came to Rome in the days of Hyginus,[2] who was the ninth bishop in succession from the Apostles.'

I. 27. 2. 'He was succeeded by Marcion of Pontus, who increased the school through his unblushing blasphemy against Him who was proclaimed as God by the law and the prophets, declaring that He was the cause of evils, desirous of war, changeable in opinion and the author of inconsistent statements. He says that Jesus came from the Father, who is above the Creator, to Judæa in the time of Pontius Pilate the governor, who was the procurator of Tiberius Cæsar, and in the form of a man was manifested to the people who were then in Judæa. He says that he rendered null and void the prophets and the law and all the works of the Creator God, whom they call Cosmocrator. He used an expurgated edition of the Gospel of Luke, removing all the passages that referred to the birth of our Lord, and many things from his teaching in which he very plainly referred to the creator of this universe as his Father. In the same way he mutilated the Epistles of Paul, cutting out all that the Apostle said about the God who made the world, and which went

[1] *i. e.* that he was the Son of Mary and Joseph, and that the Christ descended on him in the form of a dove and withdrew before Jesus was crucified. See Tert., *Praescr.*, 33. Until Theodotus (A.D. 196) it was held that the Christ was divine. The Ebionites did not deny that, but held that the Christ—the divine æon—descended on the man Jesus.

[2] A.D. 139–142.

to show that he was the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also passages bearing on the advent of our Lord, which that Apostle had quoted from the prophets.'[1]

[Marcion's system is austere and ascetic, that of Valentinus florid and oriental. Marcion professed to be purely Christian in his views. He borrowed nothing from oriental theosophy or Greek philosophy. He protested against allegorical interpretation, Church tradition, and all that savoured of Judaism. He dealt severely with the Scriptures, "using a sword rather than a pen; cutting the Scriptures to suit his views" (Tertullian, *De Praescr.*, 38). Like other Gnostics he believed in a Supreme God and a Creator God. The former he held to be perfectly good, the latter the source of evils and strife. The latter was the author of the Old Testament, the inspirer of the prophets, and the Lord of all who belong to this world. The Jews are his favourite people, and his mission is to destroy paganism and set up a Jewish empire. But the Supreme God sent His Messiah, who accommodated himself to Jewish expectations and in an unreal body proclaimed the Supreme God as Father. But the Demiurge stirred up the Jews against him; and the Devil, or Lord of matter, stirred up the Gentiles, and the Saviour was crucified. The difficulty of reconciling divine justice with divine mercy had turned Marcion against the Jewish system and Scriptures, so that he kept the Sabbath as a fast. His hatred of the Jews led him to reject the law and the prophets. He was a vegetarian, and his strict views of abstinence caused him to forbid the use of wine in the Eucharist. Irenæus tells us (I. 27. 2) that he believed in the salvation of souls, not of bodies, and that he declared that Cain and the Sodomites

[1] See further, III. 11. 9, where he gives a *résumé* of the work of the advanced critics of the second century.

and the Egyptians were saved by our Lord when he descended into Hades, but that Abel and the patriarchs were not saved, for they did not come to meet him, knowing that their God was always tempting them, and thinking he was doing likewise, and did not, therefore, believe in his announcement. A great portion of the treatise is occupied with the refutation of the Marcionite position. In IV. 6. 2 he mentions a book written by Justin against Marcion. He also promised to write a special book against him (Nos arguemus eos donante Deo, in altera conscriptione, III. 12. 12) himself, but he did not live to redeem his promise.]

I. 28. 1. 'The Encratites (ἐγκρατεῖς), followers of Saturninus and Marcion, denounce marriage, renouncing the ancient creation of God, and censuring Him for making the sexes. They also avoid animal food, and deny the salvation of the protoplast (Adam). Tatian was the first to introduce this blasphemy. He was a pupil of Justin, and while he lived he gave out nothing of this kind. But after Justin's martyrdom he withdrew from the Church, inflated with the notion of being a teacher and puffed up with the idea that he was superior to others, and founded a school of his own.'

[The book concludes with an account of the Jewish Gnostics, who combined cabbalistic notions with Gnostic views. The Ophites (ὄφις, serpent) are the chief of these. They are also called Naassenes (*naḥash*, serpent). Their seven emanations were called Ialdabaoth, Iao, Sabaoth, Adoneus, Eloeus, Oreus, Astaphæus. The son of Ialdabaoth was Nous, who was in the form of a serpent, and in his crooked ways ousted the Father.]

I. 31. 3. 'It was our duty to expose these opinions,

in the hope that some of them repenting [1] and turning to the only Creator and God of the universe might be saved. The very exposure of their tenets is a victory for us. Therefore we attempted to drag into the midst the whole badly composed body of this wretched fox and exhibit it to all. For there will be no need of long arguments when their doctrine has been exposed. It is just as if a wild beast was in the habit of rushing out upon people and destroying them from its lair in a forest. The man who isolates and cuts down the forest and exposes the beast to view has no great difficulty in effecting its capture. For the people can see it and can fire from all sides upon it, and so they destroy that destructive beast.'

[1] *poenitentiam agentes;* not doing penance as the Douay version renders it. The Greek verb means "to repent."

BOOK II

PREFACE. 'In this book we shall set forth all our ready arguments, as time permits, and shall overthrow in sections the whole of their rule (*regula*). Accordingly we have called this written work the exposure and overthrow [1] of their theory.'

II. 1. 1. 'It is well that we should begin from the first and principal heading [2]—the Creator God, who made the heaven and earth and all that is therein; whom they blasphemously describe as the "fruit of a defect," and show that there is nothing above Him nor after Him,[3] and that it was not by compulsion but of His own free will that He made all things, since He alone is God, alone is Lord, alone is Creator, alone is Father, alone is the container of all things and the cause of the existence of all things. For how could there be any *pleroma* (fullness) or principle, or power, or any other God, since it behoves God, as the fullness of all things, to contain and envelop all things, and to be contained and limited by none. For if there is anything beyond Him He is not the fullness of all things, nor does He contain all things. And according to them the All-Father, whom you know they call Proōn and Proarche, with their Pleroma, and the good God of Marcion, is shut in and

[1] *detectio et eversio.*

[2] Cf. "A Jove principium Musae" (Vergil, *Eclog.*, 3. 60).

[3] Cf. St. Patrick, *Conf.* 4, "Non est alius Deus nec ante nec erit post hunc praeter Deum Patrem ingenitum, sine principio a quo est omne principium."

surrounded by another principle which must be greater. For that which limits is greater than that which it limits, and must be the real God.'

[Irenæus argues that the Supreme God of the Gnostics lacks absolute dominion, seeing that his power is bounded by a kenoma or void space in which another God rules.]

II. 1. 2. 'And so the name of omnipotent will be reduced to an absurdity, impious as such an opinion may seem.'

II. 2. 1. 'With regard to the assertion that the world was made in opposition to the will of the Supreme Father by angels, such inability in the Supreme One would expose Him to the charge of weakness and carelessness, as He would appear to lack either the necessary power, knowledge or vigilance.'

II. 2. 3. 'But if the world was made with His consent by other powers, no matter how many or how distant from Him, He would still be, in the very last resort, the author of the creation, just as the king who made the preparations for the battle deserves the credit of the victory.'

II. 2. 4. 'But it is God in Himself, predestinating all things according to His inscrutable and ineffable plan, who made all things just as He willed. It is He who distributes to everything the harmony, order, and beginning of its creation, a spiritual and invisible order to the spiritual, a celestial to the celestial, an angelic to the angelic, a psychical to the psychical, an earthly to the earthly, giving to each its proper substance. He made all things that were made by His unwearied Word.'

II. 2. 5. 'This is peculiar to the supreme nature of God that He needs no other instruments for their making, and His own Word is sufficient and able to

form everything. "For all things are made by Him, and without Him was nothing made."' [1]

II. 2. 6. 'That this God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the Apostle Paul said, "One God the Father who is above all and through all and in *us* all."' [2]

[In the following chapters he analyzes the theory of the Valentinian Gnostics, and argues that the God who made heaven and earth, whom they called the Demiurge, is the Supreme Father revealed by Christ, but whom the Gnostics declared was unknowable and not omnipotent.]

II. 5. 2. 'If this be so the charges that are brought against the Demiurge by the heretics must fall back upon the Supreme Father Himself, who is responsible for the productions of "defect," and the works of error. And if He permitted the creation of such things, because powerless to prevent them, He were not omnipotent; but if He had the power to prevent and did not, He were a deceiver and hypocrite, the slave of necessity, not really consenting but making concessions as if he did consent.[3] And at the

[1] John i. 3.

[2] Eph. iv. 6. Notice variations. The Greek runs "one God *and* Father . . . in *you* all." Some authorities omit ὑμῖν.

[3] It is curious to find that Irenæus in his argument against this position controverts by anticipation some positions of modern philosophy. The doctrine of a limited God is held by many modern writers of the schools of Pragmatism, Pluralism and Personal Idealism. Professor James in *A Pluralistic Universe* develops this idea. It is by this hypothesis that the pain and evil and contradictions of the world are explained by him. "The only way of escape from all this is to be frankly pluralistic, and assume that the superhuman consciousness, however vast it may be, has itself an external environment and consequently is finite" (p. 310). Professor James held that this Divine consciousness is not all-embracing. Dr. Rashdall (*Personal Idealism*) likewise held that God is the supreme but not all-inclusive Spirit; that there are

beginning allowing error to be established and to increase, in later times He attempts to remove it after many have perished through the contagion.'

II. 5. 3. 'But it is not proper to say that the Supreme Deity is the slave of necessity, seeing that He is free and independent, as they do who hold that He made certain concessions contrary to His judgment. For in this case necessity would be more important and potent than God, since that which has the greater power has the greater antiquity. It was necessary, then, at the very beginning to cut off all causes of necessity, and not to shut Himself up to the having of necessity, by making any concessions improper to Himself. It would be much better, more logical and more Godlike, at the very commencement to cut away the beginning of a necessity of this kind, than to attempt afterwards, as if repenting, to eradicate the terrible effects of it. And if the Father of the universe were subservient to necessity and subject to fate, although displeased at the things that happen, He would do nothing apart from fate [1] and necessity like the Homeric Jupiter, who says: "And I gave it thee as willing, but with unwilling mind."'

---

a multitude of spirits who possess a limited independence of Him, and that He submits to this self-limitation for a beneficent purpose.

[1] Even God Himself is bound by His own laws. But they are the expression of His own Will and Mind. And in regard to Him and to His creation the Hegelian dictum, "Freedom is the truth of necessity," holds good. Necessity is the servant of God, the means by which He works out His purposes. His freedom is shown in His setting such ends before Him. But such purposes cannot be realized or carried out unless there be a settled order. God determines the whole in His plan. In His method He follows the settled order, which is the necessity of the material world. Thus the details of the larger system are carried out. In this sense alone God is bound by His own law. See D'Arcy, *God and Freedom in Human Experience*, ch. vi.

[With regard to the knowledge of God, he used two arguments—the *a posteriori* and the *a priori*. The first is the proof of natural religion, the second the universal witness of the soul naturally Christian (Tertullian).]

II. 6. 1. 'Although God is invisible to man by reason of His eminence, as regards His *providence* He can by no means be unknown [the *a posteriori* argument]. Although no man knows the Father except the Son, yet all things are aware of the fact of His existence, because the reason implanted in their minds moves them and reveals to them that there is one God the Lord of all [the *a priori* argument].'

[He now writes upon the thesis [1] that an absolutely necessary being exists as the cause of the world.]

II. 7. 5. 'For if the Creator did not fashion these things Himself, but, as a builder of no worth or a boy learning his first lesson, copied them from other originals, where did Bythus obtain the plan of that creation which he first emitted? He must have got the design from some one superior to himself, and that one again from another, and so on *ad infinitum*. We have thus an endless series of ideas unless we settle on one God, who of Himself formed the things that are created. We allow that men can design useful things, why not admit that the God who formed the world drew the plan and arranged the parts Himself?'

II. 9. 1. 'It has been the universal opinion of mankind from ancient times, from the earliest tradition of the protoplast, that there is one God the Maker of heaven and earth. This is the creed they have guarded and sung [argument for universal consent].

[1] The antithesis of this thesis in Kant's *Antinomies* is, "Neither in this world nor without the world does there exist any absolutely necessary being as its cause."

Others after them were reminded of these things by the prophets. And the very heathen have learnt it from the creation itself. For nature reveals its Author, the work suggests the Artist, and the world manifests its Designer [argument from nature]. But the whole Church throughout the world has received this tradition from the Apostles.'[1]

II. 9. 2. 'The existence of this God, then, having been thus acknowledged on all sides, and testified to by all men, that Father whom they have invented is undoubtedly non-existent and not proven.'

[He passes on to their method of expounding the parables and the Scriptures.]

II. 10. 1. 'By their method of expounding the doubtful passages of Scripture they have invented their second deity. As we have said before, they weave ropes of sand, and lead one from a lesser difficulty to a greater. For no question can be solved by another. Nor can one difficulty be explained by another, nor one enigma by another. But obscure things of this nature are solved by what is clear, plain, and generally accepted.'

[In his criticism of the fact that the Gnostics had æons called "Silence" (sige) and "Word" (logos) in the same Pleroma, he makes use of certain Philonic expressions, *endiathetic* and *prophoric*. The Gnostics held that the Word was prophoric. Irenæus objected to this.]

II. 12. 3. 'It is impossible that there can be Sige when Logos is present, or a manifestation of Logos when Sige is present. These are mutually destructive. And if they say that the Logos is endiathetic,[2] Sige

[1] See further, II. 27. 2; IV. 2. 7.

[2] The Philonic distinction (taken from the Stoics) between ἐνδιάθετος λόγος, word abiding within the conception or

will also be endiathetic; and will be destroyed by the endiathetic word. But the very mode of its emission shows that it is not endiathetic.'[1]

[In criticizing the emission of the æons, he shows the psychological distinction between God and man. He says the mental process in man, who is a "composite creature," passes through many stages from perception to thought, from thought to reflection, and from reflection to reason; but with God, who is untouched by passion and is simple Being, the process is simple and uniform. His analysis of the hidden processes of the Nous, or understanding, reminds one of Kant's transcendental *Analytik*. Perception, thought, intellectual perception, deliberation, examination of thought—all originate from the same understanding, but represent different stages of development. The underlying synthetic[2] unity of knowledge is the Nous, or understanding.]

II. 13. 1. 'The Nous is the source and origin, the fountain-head of all rationality.'

II. 13. 2. 'The first exercise of the powers of the Nous with regard to anything is called *ennoia* (perception). When this gains strength and time and embraces the whole soul, it becomes *enthymesis*

---

thought, and προφορικὸς λόγος, or word uttered, was afterwards developed in theology. Theophilus says that the Son of God was both: *endiathetic* in the heart of God, and begotten by Him to be *prophoric*. Some of the Fathers denied that he was *prophoric*, as it implied lack of substance. See Newman's *Athanasius*, II. 341.

[1] *Endiathetic* means an internal, or intellectual, process; *prophoric*, an external and material process. The Gnostics would seem to have held the *Logos prophorikos*.

[2] Cf. II. 29. 3: "The intellect of man, his thought, intention, and other such things are nothing but the soul (*anima*); and the operations of the soul have no substance apart from the soul."

(consideration). Consideration, when it lingers over the same subject, and is, as it were, approved, becomes intelligent perception (*sensatio*). This, when it has been developed, is termed deliberation (*consilium*); and the continual exercise of deliberation becomes the examination of thought. The Nous controls these various processes. Though itself invisible, it sends forth speech by means of the aforesaid processes, as the sun emits light by its rays, but is itself sent forth of none.'

II. 13. 3. 'They who say that Ennoia is an emanation of God, that Nous had been emitted from Ennoia, and so on, have fallen into the error of imputing human affections, passions and thoughts to Deity, whom they say is unknown and is not the creator. But God is untouched by passion or emotion like man, and is simple Being. There is no composition, but uniform reason with Him. For He is all mind, and all Spirit, all perception, all thought, all reason, all hearing, all eye, all light, and all source of every good.'

II. 13. 8. 'Whereas in man the *logos* (word) proceeds from the *nous* (mind), the process is simple and simultaneous with God. With Him there is nothing before or after, nor any other heterogeneous distinction, but He is all Nous, all Logos, all equal, similar, homogeneous, uniform, and constant.[1] He who says that God is all vision and all hearing (for in that He sees, in that He also hears; and in that He hears, in that He also sees) does not err. But he who says that He is all understanding and all word, and in that He is understanding in that He is also word, and that this Nous is His word, will have too low an opinion

[1] Cf. II. 28. 5: "For God is all mind and all Logos. What He thinks that He speaks, and what He speaks, that He thinks. For His thought is Logos, and Logos is mind, and the Father Himself is all-embracing mind."

of the All-Father; but yet a more suitable one than those who apply the generation of the prolative[1] word of men to the Eternal Word of God, assigning to Him just such another beginning and genesis of his prolation as their own speech has. For in what respect will the Word of God, nay, even God Himself, differ from man, if they have the same order and manner of generation?'

II. 13. 9. 'For in the name of God are implied both understanding and word, and life and immortality, and truth and wisdom and goodness, and all such qualities. And one cannot say that understanding is before life, for understanding is life. Neither can one say that life is after understanding, for that would mean that He who is the universal understanding (*omnium sensus*) would be at some one time without life. Their remarks regarding the affections and emotions of man, the origin of his intentions, and the emissions of his words are correct, but it is wrong to apply such to God.[2] But when referring the experience and happenings of human life to the divine reason, they seem to speak suitably in the eyes of those who are ignorant of God, and when describing the projection[3] of the Word of God, they fall back upon "deep and marvellous mysteries revealed to no other man."'

II. 14. 1. 'With much greater plausibility and acceptability Antiphanes, the old writer of comedy, described the origin of the universe. For he declares that Chaos is sent forth from Night and Silence;[4]

[1] *prolativus* is the Latin for *prophorikos*. Damasus, writing against the Arians, says of the word, "nec prolativum ut generationem ei demas" (*Ep.* II. p. 203).

[2] A fine argument against anthropomorphic and anthropopathic views of Deity.

[3] *probolen* (προβολή).

[4] See Aristophanes, *Aves*, 694, for an account of the pagan cosmogony which resembles the myths of the Gnostics.

and then from Chaos and Night Love [1] issues, and from him comes Light, and then the primary generation of the gods. Then follows a second generation of gods and the creation of the world, and the formation of man by these latter deities.[2] This myth they have borrowed, merely changing the names, *e. g.* substituting Bythus and Sige for Night and Silence, and Nous for Chaos, and the Word for Love. Instead of the first order of gods they have invented æons; in the place of the secondary deities, they speak of the economy of the mother outside the Pleroma, calling it the second ogdoad. The creation and formation of man they describe in the same way. And the things that are declaimed in comedy by the splendid voices of actors on the stage they transfer to their own system, using the same arguments, but merely changing the names.

'And not only have they manifestly borrowed from the comic poets, but they have collected many sayings of the philosophers who knew not God, and stitching together a garment [3] of many colours out of a bundle of miserable rags have made for themselves a patchwork robe of borrowed stuffs. Thales said water was the beginning of all things. It is the same to say Bythus as to say water. Homer described Oceanus as the origin of the gods and Thetis as their mother. This they have transferred to their Bythus and Sige. Anaximander supposed that this infinite [4] expanse

[1] Parmenides and Hesiod say that Love is the eternal intellect that surpasses all the immortal gods and leads Chaos into Cosmos (Aristotle, *Metaph.* I. 4).

[2] This is from Plato's system, see *Timæus*, p. 41.

[3] Lit. a cento. For an example see I. 9. 4, where a Gnostic cento composed out of various portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is cited.

[4] τὸ ἄπειρον. Senseless matter with him; with Anaximenes it was the boundless atmosphere. Anaximander believed in an infinity of worlds, and said that the first creatures were aquatic animals.

was the source of everything, having in itself the seeds from which all things are derived, and from which infinite worlds arose. But Anaxagoras,[1] who is also called the Atheist, declared that animals were made of particles [2] that fell from heaven to earth. These things they have transferred to their system, saying that they are the "seeds" of the impious Anaxagoras.'

II. 14. 3. 'From Democritus and Epicurus they have derived their theory of shadow and void. For they wrote extensively about a void and atoms.[3] When they assert that these things are images of those, they are clearly borrowing from Democritus and Plato. For Democritus was the first to state that various distinct images [4] descended from space to this world. And, again, Plato postulates three principles—matter, form, and God. From these they (the Gnostics) have borrowed their images and types of the things above.'

II. 14. 4. 'From Anaxagoras, Empedocles and Plato they got the notion that the Creator formed the world out of previously existing matter. They, too, forsooth, were inspired by their mother. And that of necessity everything returns to that from which it was made, and that even God was the slave of this necessity, so that He could not give immortality to the mortal, or incorruption to the corruptible, but that each being must return to a like substance, was asserted by those of the Porch, called Stoics, and all

[1] He held that *Nous* was the supreme organizing principle and cause of all things, and was the only simple unmixed substance extant, the cause of movement and source of moral distinctions.

[2] These particles were homogeneous (homœomeric). The idea being that bone is formed of bony atoms, flesh of fleshy atoms, etc., all composite bodies being ὁμοιομερεῖς.

[3] See Lucretius *passim*, and I. 10. 25.

[4] He means the εἴδωλα, which were different from the prototypal ἰδέαι of Plato.

poets and writers who are ignorant of God.[1] This is what these equally atheistical folk say, when they assign its province to each thing, viz. that within the Pleroma to the spiritual, the intermediate place to the psychical, and the earthly place to the material class. Their theory of the Saviour as the creation of the æons, all of whom contributing, as it were, their flower for him, is nothing but the Pandora of Hesiod. From the Cynics they have taken over their views that it makes no difference what food they take or what deeds they do, for nothing can injure their nobility. Their brevity and casuistry in argument is Aristotelian.'[2]

II. 14. 6. 'Their method of reducing the universe to numbers is taken from the Pythagoreans. For they were the first to regard numbers as the initiating principle, and they held the beginning of numbers to be the odd and the even,[3] from which all that is material and immaterial came. And they affirmed that the first principles of intellectual substance, and of sensible and material existence, were different. Of the first principles all things are made as a statue of its metal and of its typal form. They (the Gnostics)

[1] Anaxagoras held that *ex nihilo nil fit*; the Stoics that even God is the subject of necessity, or fate. Cicero (*de N. Deor.* II. 30) argued against this view: "The nature of God is not all-powerful if it is subject to the necessity or nature by which the heavens and earth are ruled; but nothing is higher than God, therefore the world must be ruled by Him. And He is subject and obedient to no natural power (*naturae*)."

[2] *minutiloquium*, hair-splitting. Cf. Tertullian, *Anim.* 6.: "Aristotelis minutiloquium."

[3] Cf. Aristotle, *Met.* I. 5. 986: "They regard number as the originating principle and as the material of things that are, and as passions and states. But the elements of number are the even and the odd. One of these is finite, the other infinite. But the one is from both these, for it is both odd and even. And number is from the one. And the whole heaven consists of numbers."

have transferred all this to their things outside the Pleroma.' [1]

II. 14. 8. 'And so on, by appealing to human feelings and to the fact that many who ignore God say the very same things, they appear to lead away certain people, expounding the genesis of the Word of God, and acting the midwife to the emissions of life, understanding and God.'

[Having shown that the Gnostics borrowed many of their notions, which they claimed to be original and specially revealed to them, from the Greeks, Irenæus criticizes the manner in which the æons were produced according to them.]

II. 17. 1. 'How, then, were the remaining æons emitted? Were they united with Him who sent them forth as the rays are blended with the sun? Or were they actually and individually sent forth in such a way that each possessed his own particular form, as is the case with human procreation? Or was it after the manner of germination, just as branches grow upon a tree? Were they all sent forth at once? Are some of them simple and uniform, and equal and similar in all respects, like spirit and light? Or are they composite and distinct?'

II. 17. 3. 'If, again, the æons were derived from Logos, and Logos from Nous, and Nous from Bythus, in precisely the same way as lights are kindled from a light, as torches, for example, from a torch, then they shall no doubt differ in their generation and size

[1] A difficult sentence follows, which probably means that the intellect in its pursuit of knowledge always comes back to the indivisible one. "The one in the Pythagorean system (see Simplicius, *Physica* 36, cited by Ritter and Preller, *Greek Philosophy*, p. 58) is the beginning of all things." The Tetras, as being the square of the Dyad, and the Pentas were also mystical numbers with the Pythagoreans. Without numbers, they said, no knowledge was possible.

from one another; but being all of the same substance [1] with the author of their production, they must either all remain for ever impassible, or their Father must share their passions. For the torch which has been subsequently kindled will not show a different light from its predecessors.'

[Irenæus contrasts the Father of the Gnostics with the Father of the Christians, and the work of the Gnostic æon Christ with that of our Lord.]

II. 17. 11. 'How did the æons find rest and knowledge when they learnt that the Father is not to be comprehended? For if He had remained unknown by reason of His infinite greatness, by reason of His infinite love, He ought to have saved them from their eager desire to know what they should have known from the very beginning, namely, that the Father is altogether incomprehensible.'

II. 18. 3. 'This Christ, by teaching the æons not to seek the Father, for they would not find Him, makes them perfect; whereas our Lord, by seeking and finding the Father, makes his disciples perfect.'

[He then passes on to criticize their explanation of certain incidents of and matters connected with our Lord's life, such as the number of his disciples, his Passion, which they treated as types.]

II. 19. 1. 'Therefore our Lord said, "Every idle word that men shall speak they shall give account of in the day of judgment" (Matt. xii. 36). For all who have uttered such idle words in the ears of men shall be present in the judgment, and shall give an account of all their foolish conjectures and lies against God, saying that they can know the spiritual Pleroma because of the nature of their seed, their inner man pointing

[1] *ejusdem substantiae* = ὁμοούσιος, a word which occurs frequently in the treatise.

out to them the true Father, but that the psychical class require to be trained through their senses. While the Creator, who took up the whole seed from the Mother, knew nothing at all about it, and understood none of the things connected with the Pleroma.'

II. 20. 2. 'But neither was the passion of Christ like the passion of their æon,[1] nor did it take place under similar circumstances. For their æon suffered a passion which led to dissolution and destruction, so that the sufferer was in danger of being ruined. But our Lord Christ suffered a passion which was great, but to which he might not yield.[2] And he not only was in no danger of being destroyed, but he strengthened man, who had been corrupted, with his strength and recalled him to incorruption. Their æon suffered in its unavailing search for the Father. Our Lord suffered that he might lead those who had strayed from the Father back to Him and the knowledge of Him. And his (our Lord's) passion bore the fruit of courage and virtue; and the passion of the other had but a weak and worthless fruit. And our Lord by his passion conferred on those who believe in him "the power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy" (Luke x. 19), that is, the prince of the apostasy. And our Lord by his Passion abolished death, did away with error, put an end to corruption, and destroyed ignorance. But he manifested life, displayed the truth, and conferred immortality.'

II. 22. 1. 'There are not, therefore, thirty æons, nor did our Saviour come to his baptism when thirty

[1] Sophia, whose wanderings after the Father were checked by Horos.

[2] Reading *cui non cederet* for *quae non accederet*, which we might render, "which was no ordinary one." *Accederet* would mean, "which might have no increase" (*accessio*), i. e. was always on the straining-point The meaning required by the context is a passion that would not yield to dissolution.

years old to show that their silent [1] æons were thirty. They also say that he suffered in the twelfth month, a year after his baptism, for it is written, "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord and the day of vengeance" (Isa. lxi. 2). But the prophet was not speaking of a day of twelve hours, nor of a year of twelve months. For the prophets spake in parables and allegories. And most of their sayings are not to be literally interpreted.'

II. 22. 2. 'The day of vengeance, therefore, means the judgment. But the acceptable year of the Lord is the time in which they are called by him who believe in Him, and are acceptable to God. It means, therefore, the whole time from his advent "to the consummation" (Matt. xxviii. 19), in which time he gathers in those who are saved as fruit.'

II. 22. 3. 'It is to be marvelled at how they say they have discovered the deep things of God, and yet they have not examined the gospels to see how often our Lord went up to Jerusalem at the season of the Passover. First, he went up after turning the water into wine. After that he went up a second time, at the Passover, when he cured the paralytic at the pool.[2] And then six days before the Passover he came to Bethany (John xii. 1). That these three times in which Passover is mentioned make more than a single year every one will agree.'

II. 22. 4. 'When thirty years old he came to his baptism. Having reached the age of a teacher, he

[1] For *tacitos*. Harvey conjectures *tacitus*, i. e. our Lord was a *silent* witness to this fact.

[2] John v. 1: "After this there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." This feast was thought to be Pentecost by the early Greek Church. Some commentators regard it as the Feast of Purim; others, Westcott included, regard it as the Feast of Trumpets. Irenæus omits to count the Passover of John vi. 4.

went to Jerusalem in order that all might hear him as teacher. For he was not other than he seemed, as some say, who introduce a putative or imaginary Christ. Accordingly, when he was a teacher he had the age of a teacher, not rejecting nor surpassing man, nor annulling his own law for the human race in himself, but sanctifying every age by its resemblance to himself. For he came to save all through himself—all, I say, who through him are regenerated [1] into God, infants, children, boys, young men and elders. Therefore, he passed through every age, and became an infant for infants, sanctifying the infants; a child among children, sanctifying all of that age, at the same time being made an example for them of piety, righteousness and obedience. Among the young men he was a young man, becoming an example for young men, sanctifying them for the Lord. So also he became an elder among the elders, so that he might become a perfect master in every particular, not only in the exposition of the truth, but also in the matter of age, thereby sanctifying the elders and becoming an example to them. Then he passed to his death, so that he might be "the first-begotten from the dead."'

[Irenæus makes an extraordinary statement about our Lord's age.]

II. 22. 5. 'But they, in order that they may keep up their fiction about the acceptable year of the Lord, say that he preached for one year, and suffered in the twelfth month. They take away from him his more necessary and honourable age, his more advanced

[1] qui per eum renascuntur in Deum. This is a reference to baptism. Cf. III. 19: "potestatem *regenerationis in Deum* mandans discipulis, dicebat eis euntes docete," etc. (Giving his disciples the authority to baptize into God, lit. of regeneration into).

age, I mean, in which he excelled all other teachers. For how had he disciples if he did not teach? And how could he teach if he had not the teacher's age? He came to his baptism before he was fully thirty years old, when "he was beginning his thirtieth year," as Luke said (Luke iii. 23), and from his baptism he preached only one year (according to them). And he suffered at the conclusion of his thirtieth year (according to them) while still a young man, before he had reached a riper age. Thirty is the first stage of a young man's age, and extends to forty, as all will admit. But from the fortieth and fiftieth year one's life declines into the older age, which our Lord had when he taught, as the Gospel and all the elders testify, who met John, the disciple of the Lord, in Asia. They say that John was their authority for this statement. For he remained with them until the times of Trajan.[1] Some of them not only saw John, but also the other Apostles, and they heard the same thing from them and appeal to a tradition of the same kind.'[2]

II. 22. 6. 'Even the Jews who argued with our Lord Jesus Christ make this point clear. For they said to him, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" (John viii. 57). This would be an appropriate remark to one who had passed his fortieth year, and was not far from his fiftieth. If he was thirty years old they would have said, "Thou art not yet forty years old." But they mentioned the next period of his age, either knowing it from the

[1] Trajan began his reign in A.D. 98. The tradition was that John lived to a hundred years. See also III. 3.

[2] The authority for this tradition was probably Papias. See this writer's *Irenæus of Lugdunum* (Cambridge Press), p. 216. Tradition in matters of detail like this may be unsatisfactory, while in matters of principle and doctrine it may be a sound guide. Notice that Irenæus held that our Lord's ministry extended over ten years.

census or from his appearance.[1] He was not, therefore, very far from his fiftieth year.'

II. 24. 1. 'Applying the name Jesus, which belongs to a different language, to the Greek numbers, they sometimes say that it is *episemon*,[2] having six letters, and at other times that it represents the fullness of the ogdoad, having the number 888.'

II. 24. 2. 'But *Iēsous* in the Hebrew language consists of two and a half letters,[3] as their experts say, and signifies the Lord who contains heaven and earth.'

[He shows that the number five, which the Gnostics did not use, might have been a symbolical figure, quoting passages in which the number five or groups of five occur. He says that there were five points of the cross, five laws on each of Moses' tablets (so Josephus), etc.]

II. 25. 1. 'Should any one say, "What, then, were all these casual and haphazard, the positions of names, the election of the Apostles, and our Lord's work?" We would answer, "No, indeed, but all things were done with great wisdom and care by God, both in ancient and modern times, and these are not to be connected with the number thirty, but with the underlying reason and argument. A rule does not arise from numbers, but numbers from a rule. Nor is God to be explained by the things made, but the

[1] It is quite possible that the Jews were deceived by our Lord's appearance. He would naturally look older for his years than other men.

[2] *episemon* (ἐπίσημον, I. 14. 4), a symbolical number. In Greek there are three such numbers—Bau, or Digamma (6); Koppa (90), Sanpi (900). The Greek letters of the name Ἰησοῦς (Jesus) = 10 + 8 + 200 + 70 + 400 + 200 = 888.

[3] ישו. Although this passage is obscured through copyists' errors, the point is clear that Irenæus makes, namely, that it is impossible to explain a Hebrew name by Greek numbers.

things made by God. For all things are from one and the same God.'

[Irenæus gives an interesting parallel from music. He points out that the harmony of creation is made up of many discordant factors.]

II. 25. 2. 'Many and various are the things that are made. When you take them in detail they are mutually antagonistic and discordant. But, taken in connection with the whole creation, they are agreeable and harmonious. Just as the sound of the harp, composed of many different notes, makes one symphony. The lover of truth must not be misled by the difference of each sound, nor suspect that there was one author for this and another for that, or that one composed the bass, another the treble, and a third the middle notes; but considering the wisdom, justice, goodness and service of the whole work he should regard it as one thing. For they who hear a melody ought to praise the musician, and admire the raising of some notes, attend to the lowering of others and listen attentively to the careful modulation of chords.[1] He should consider it (this music) a type of other things, and should inquire the reference and the cause of each, applying our rule, and never straying from the artist nor losing faith in the one God who made it all.'

[Irenæus contrasts divine and human knowledge.]

II. 25. 3. 'But if any one cannot find a solution for all his difficulties, let him reflect that man is infinitely inferior to God. For thou, O man, art not an uncreated being, neither didst thou always

[1] *extensio, laxamentum, inter utrumque temperamentum* are musical terms difficult to explain. The point intended by Irenæus is the resolution of discords in the one harmony of the universe.

exist with God [1] as His own Word. But by reason of His exceeding goodness, now receiving the beginning of thy creation, thou dost learn gradually from the Word the dispensations of God.'

II. 25. 4. 'Observe, then, the bounds of thy knowledge. And do not imagine that thou canst surpass Deity. For He is not to be surpassed. . . . For thy Maker is without end or limit. Nor even if thou hadst measured this whole world, as one who goes through a workman's shop, wouldst thou comprehend all the depth and height and length that is in Him (Eph. iii. 18).'

II. 26. 1. 'It is much better, then, and more advantageous to be uneducated and ignorant people, and to be brought near to God by love, than to think oneself very learned and wise, and to be found to be blasphemers against God. For "knowledge puffeth up but love edifieth" (1 Cor. viii. 1). Paul was not disparaging the true knowledge of God, but he knew that some uplifted by their knowledge fell away from the love of God, and on that account imagined themselves perfect. And what is a greater form of conceit than to consider oneself superior to, and better than, one's own Maker, the bestower of one's breath and existence? Better then, as I said, to know nothing at all, not even the reason of any one thing's existence, and to believe God and abide in His love, than to be inflated by knowledge, and to fall away from that love which gives life to man. Better to desire to know nothing but Jesus Christ the Son of God, who was crucified for us, than to be led into impiety by subtle questioning and casuistry.' [2]

[1] neque semper coexistebas Deo sicut proprium ejus Verbum. An important passage in connection with Christology, as it bears upon the pre-existence of Christ, of whom Arius said "there was a time when the Son was not."

[2] *minutiloquium*, hair-splitting. Cf. II. 14. 4, "minutiloquium cum sit Aristotelicum."

II. 26. 2. 'Suppose any one should ask us if the total number of all the things that have been made and are being made is known to God, and if each several thing has received, in accordance with His providence, its own proper quantity. Suppose we agree and confess that not one of the things that have been made or are being made escapes the knowledge of God, but through His providence each individual thing received and receives its condition, order, number and quantity, and that not one of these has been made or is being made casually or without significance, but with great skill and sublime understanding, and that the reason is wonderful and truly divine which can analyze and announce the particular causes of this kind. Suppose he accepts our testimony and proceeds to the counting of the sand and the pebbles and the waves and stars, and the causes of the number discovered, would not such a one be wasting his labour and be justly regarded as absurd and foolish by all sensible people?'

[Irenæus points out how the parables are to be interpreted.]

II. 27. 1. 'But a sound and safe and reverent mind that loves the truth will study with eagerness the things that God has left within the reach of man. In these he will advance by his daily work, making his study of them easier. Such are the things that are placed under our very eyes, and whatever is said openly and without ambiguity in its very wording in the Scriptures. Accordingly, the parables are to be interpreted by expressions that are free from ambiguity. For in this way the expounder of them expounds without risk, and the parables will be universally expounded in the same way, and the body of truth entire, unshaken, and with well-proportioned limbs endures. But it were folly to connect the

expositions of the parables with things that are abstruse and concealed from our ken in a capricious way. For in this way there will be no rule (or canon) of truth. But there will be just as many conflicting truths as there are expositors. And by following this method a man will ever seek and never find, because he has thrown away the principle of solution. And when the bridegroom shall come, the man whose lamp is unprepared and shines with no clear light has recourse to those who in the darkness tear to pieces the parables in their exposition, abandoning him who by his simple and direct preaching gives him admission gratis, and so is excluded from his wedding.'

II. 27. 2. 'Since, then, all the Scriptures, both the prophecies and the Gospels,[1] openly and without obscurity, and in a manner that can be understood in the same way by all, although all do not believe, declare that there is only one God to the exclusion of others, and that He made all things, visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly, in the waters and beneath the earth. [The argument of revealed religion.] Again, since the very creation in which we live, by the very parts of it that can be seen, bears witness to this same fact that its Maker and Ruler is one (cf. Rom. i. 20), they are very dull who blindfold their eyes against so clear a revelation, and will not see the light of the preaching. [The argument of natural religion.]'

II. 27. 3. 'And because nothing is said openly or directly about their fictitious Father in Scripture, they declare that our Saviour privately taught these things not to all the disciples, but to a few who could understand.'

[He argues that we cannot have universal knowledge

[1] Meaning both the Old and New Testaments.

in this life, and that difficulties that we cannot solve must be left with God. He employs the argument from analogy of nature to revelation afterwards used by Origen and Bishop Butler.]

II. 28. 1. 'Having, then, the very rule of truth, and the testimony openly given about God, we ought not reject the sound and sure knowledge of God; but rather directing our solutions of our problems to this end, we should be disciplined by the investigation of the mystery and dispensation of the God who is, and grow more and more in our love of Him, who has done and does so much for us. But if we cannot find the solution of every scriptural difficulty we should not be driven to seek another God, for that were gross impiety. All such matters we should leave in the hands of God, who has made us, being duly aware that the Scriptures are perfect, having been uttered by the Word of God and His Spirit. It is no wonder if in spiritual and celestial matters we have this experience, seeing that many things which are practically before our eyes are beyond our ken. These very things we commit to God. For example, what explanation can we give of the rising of the Nile; of the habitat of the migratory birds; of the ebb and flow of the tide; of the formation of rain, lightning, thunder, the winds, the clouds, the phases of the moon, the differences of liquids, metals, stones and other things?[1] If, then, there are certain phenomena of nature which are hid from us, there is no ground for complaint if the Scriptures contain many things too deep for us,[2] which must be left to God, so that

[1] These natural phenomena are no longer mysteries.

[2] Origen, *Philocalia*, p. 23: "He who believes the Scriptures to have proceeded from Him who is the author of nature, may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties in it as are found in the constitution of nature." This analogical argument is used here by Irenæus. It was afterwards

He should ever be the teacher and man the pupil. For, as the Apostle said, when everything else has been destroyed, these alone, faith, hope and love, endure (1 Cor. xiii. 13). For there is always faith in our master assuring us that He alone is God; always love for God, for He is our only Father; and always hope from time to time to receive more and to learn more of God that He is good, that the riches of His grace are unlimited, His kingdom without end, and His rule unbounded.'

II. 28. 3. 'If, then, in this manner we commit certain difficulties to God, we shall maintain our own faith, and we shall continue without peril (to our souls). Moreover, every Scripture given to us by God, will be found to be consistent, the parables will agree with the things that are clearly stated, and the things that are clearly stated will explain the parables. And so the manifold utterances of its words will sound as one harmonious melody in our souls. For example, if any one should inquire what God was doing before He made the world, we reply that the answer lies with God. The Scriptures teach us that this world was made in its perfect condition by God, receiving its beginning in time. But no Scripture reveals what God did before that.'

[He discusses at length in the next chapter the generation of the Word, deprecating the example of those who conceive the "emission" of the Word after human analogy and indulge in rash speculation about God, saying that speech (logos) is emitted from thought. He points out the two meanings of logos, reason and word, in Greek, and argues that human psychological distinctions are not found in Deity.]

---

developed by Butler in his well-known *Analogy*, which is one of the most famous Apologetic works of the English Church. Its use is of course, negative, not constructive.

II. 28. 4. 'In the case of man this holds good, but in the case of God such an emission is not logical, seeing that He is all mind, all reason, all operating Spirit, all light, and always one and the same. With man the slowness of speech retards the swift thought of his mind, but God being altogether Mind and altogether Word, what He thinks He expresses, and what He expresses He thinks. For His Thought is Word, and His Word is Mind, and the Father Himself is the all-inclusive Mind.'

[In the next paragraph he attacks the Gnostic method of illustrating the generation of the eternal word of God by the prolative[1] (prophoric) word of man.]

II. 28. 6. 'Conceited beyond measure, you boldly assert that you know the ineffable mysteries of God, when even our Lord, the Son of God, himself confessed that the Father alone knew the day and hour of the judgment (Mark xiii. 13). If the Son was not ashamed, then, to refer the knowledge of that day to the Father, but said what was true, neither let us be ashamed to reserve for God the questions that are too great for us. For no man is above his master. Should any one, then, ask, How was the Son produced from the Father? Our answer is that no man understands that production, or generation, or proclamation, or revelation, or whatever one may style his ineffable generation.'

II. 28. 7. 'We must also leave to God such questions as why, when all things were made by God, some transgressed and rebelled, and others, nay, the majority, remained faithful and obedient. . . . Seeing

[1] Cf. Clement of Alexandria: "The Word of the Universal Father is not the *prophoric* word, but the most manifest wisdom and goodness of God." Prolation (*proferre*, bring forth), sometimes used of pronunciation.

that we only know in part we must leave these general questions with Him who gives us grace in part. For when we seek in Him the things that are above us, and to which it is not for us to attain, we shall not be so audacious as to explain [1] God, and things we have not discovered.'

[He proceeds to discuss the nature of the soul, and argues that the body must share in the salvation of the soul.]

II. 29. 2. 'It is clear that the works of righteousness are done in the body. . . . The bodies, then, which have shared in righteousness along with the souls that have shared in the same, shall occupy the place of consolation,[2] if indeed righteousness is able to lead thither those who have shared in it. And so the statement about the resurrection of the body, which we believe, will be established as true. For God, resuscitating our mortal bodies which have acted righteously, will make them immortal and incorcoruptible. For God is superior to nature, and with Him is to will, because He is good, and to be able, because He is powerful, and to accomplish, because He is rich (resourceful) and perfect.'

[Here follows an interesting psychological statement.]

II. 29. 3. 'They say that the souls endure in the intermediate place, but the bodies, inasmuch as they are material things, when dissolved in matter are destroyed by the fire that is in it. And so when the body has been destroyed and the soul remains in the intermediate place, there will be nothing left of man to enter the Pleroma. For the intellect of man, his mind and thought and intention, and other things of that nature, are nothing apart from the

[1] *pandamus Deum.* [2] *refrigerii locus.*

soul. But they are the motions and operations of the soul, having no existence apart from or without the soul.'

[Irenæus follows the line of argument that the Creator (Demiurge) must be the Supreme God rather than that the Supreme God must be the Demiurge. In an argument *ad hominem* he now challenges the Gnostics, who style the Demiurge (the Creator) "the fruit of a defect," to show their superiority to Him, on the principle that the better man is proved by his works.]

II. 30. 3. 'What work of theirs, wrought by their "Saviour" or their "Mother," can they indicate as evincing greater power, or glory, or intelligence, than the works of Him who has arranged all these things? What heavens have they made fast? What earth have they established? What stars have they sent forth? What constellations have they caused to shine? What rivers have they made to flow, and what springs to well forth? With what flowers and trees have they adorned the earth, or what multitude of beautiful creatures, with reason and without reason, have they created? Who can enumerate all the other things which have been established by the power and are controlled by the wisdom of God? What shall I say of those existences which are beyond the heavens and do not pass away—angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, powers? To what similar achievement of their own can they, who are the workmanship of God, point us?'

[In the next chapter he discusses the assumption of St. Paul to the third heaven, "Whether in the body or out of the body God knows"[1] (2 Cor. xii. 2).]

[1] This text is quoted defectively, omitting "I know not" (οὐκ οἶδα).

II. 30. 7. 'According to them his "inner man," which is invisible as they say, could not only reach the third heaven but even the Mother Herself. But he (Paul) added "Whether in the body or out of the body God knows" in order to show that the body should not be held to be incapable of sharing in that vision; and also that no one should say that on account of the weight of his body he was not taken up. But he was even permitted to ascend thither without the body, and to see the spiritual mysteries which are the operations of God.'

[The chapter concludes with a noble hymn-like statement of belief in the Father and the Son.]

II. 30. 9. 'He only is God who made all things. He alone is omnipotent. He only is Father who made and created all things, visible and invisible, objects of sense and objects of understanding, things in heaven and things in earth by the Word of His Power. He adapted and arranged all things by His wisdom. He contains all things and is contained of none. He is Creator, Maker and Fashioner. He is the Moulder and Lord of all. And neither is there anything above or beside Him. Neither "Bythus," nor "Proarche," nor heavens, nor virginal light, nor unnameable Æon. But there is only one God, the Creator. He is above every principality and power and dominion and virtue. He is Father, He is God, He is Founder and Maker and Builder. He made all these things by Himself, that is, by His Word and His Wisdom. He formed men, He planted Paradise.[1] He made the world, He sent the flood, He saved Noah. He is the God of the living, whom the Law proclaims, the prophets preach, and Christ reveals; whom the Apostles announce, and in whom

[1] The idea of garden is conveyed by "plantavit." Paradise means park or garden.

the Church believes. He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, through His Word who is His Son. Through him He is revealed and manifested to all to whom He is made known. For they only know Him to whom the Son reveals Him. But the Son always existing with the Father from of old, yea, from the beginning, ever revealeth the Father to angels, archangels, powers and virtues, and to whomsoever he pleaseth.'

[Interesting reference to miracles of healing performed in the Church.]

II. 31. 2. 'The followers of Simon and others, who are said to perform miracles, will be shown to do what they do not in the power of God, nor in truth, nor for the benefit of mankind. But they will be proved to have worked for destruction and delusion, and by magical elusions and every form of fraud, inflicting greater injury than they confer good upon those who believe them. For they cannot give sight to the blind, nor hearing to the deaf, nor banish any demons except those they introduce,[1] if indeed they can do that. Neither can they cure the feeble, the lame or the paralysed, or those who suffer in any

[1] This passage, by anticipation, contains a warning against Spiritualism and the attempt to set up communication with the other world by its votaries. It is now known that much of the pretended spirit communication is due to trickery; that many of its physical wonders are done by the conjurors; but a residue of manifestations by mediums or psychics remains unexplained on rational principles. One explanation suggested is that it is the work of evil spirits. Is automatic writing, for example, the work of unconscious cerebration, or a proof of possession?

In the hands of many this kind of speculation, unlawful in itself as Irenæus has shown, for God has revealed to us all He wishes us to know, is fraught with danger to the spiritual and moral life of others. The history of necromancy is a black chapter in the annals of humanity and was justly described as *the Black Art*.

part of their body, or renew the health of those who have lost it by some accident.[1] So far are they from raising the dead, as our Lord did, and the Apostles did with prayer, and is often done in an emergency among the brotherhood. The whole Church praying with much fasting and litany, the breath of the dead has returned and the man has been given back to the entreaties of the saints.'

II. 31. 3. 'Since, then, we find among them fraud, seduction and magical appearances for the delusion of men; but in the Church we have pity, compassion, firmness and truth for the assistance of man freely and without fear, even we ourselves contributing our own possessions for the well-being of men. The things our patients require and very often have not got they obtain from us. Truly this shows that they are far remote from the divine substance (they claim), divine benignity, and spiritual virtue, but are wholly replete with every sort of fraud, rebellious and false inspiration, demoniacal operation and idolatrous apparition.'

[He adds that the prophecy of the dragon in Rev. xii. 4 applies to such intercourse with demons.[2]]

II. 32. 1. 'And their impious opinions regarding deeds which are bad, but which they say they ought to do, will be disproved by the teaching of our Lord, who taught us that the wish to commit sin was as guilty as the overt act, that to be angry with one's

[1] Here he furnishes us with another argument by anticipation. This is against that form of modern Gnosticism called Christian Science. It is a delusion and a snare to deny the reality of sorrow, sickness and death, and assert the reality of cures which can exist solely in the imagination of the patient and the performer. Let them take up Irenæus' challenge and show a fractured limb made whole by their method.

[2] A similar passage occurs in *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 96.

brother without a cause was to be condemned, and that we should not only not hate men but should love our enemies . . . and should not only not injure our neighbours, nor do them any wrong, but that even those who are badly treated should be generous, and show kindness to the others and pray for them that they may repent and be saved, and in no respects follow the contumely, lust and pride of the others.'

[After refuting the Gnostics, who say that everything, immoral as well as moral, should be done by man, he passes on from ethical to general subjects and argues that according to their principle every human art and science should be studied by them.]

II. 32. 2. 'Although they say that they should have every sort of experience in one life in order if possible to pass on to perfection, we do not find them trying to study any of those things which are artistic and laborious, and considered excellent by all people. If they must pass through every sort of work and experience they must first of all study the arts, intellectual and practical, which require self-restraint, labour, study and endurance; for example, every branch of music, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and every subject of intellectual reasoning; also all branches of medicine, the science of herbs, and all things that are beneficial to man; also painting, statuary, carving in bronze and marble, and such like; also every class of farm work, veterinary and agricultural, and the crafts that are the foundation of every art, and those that concern the maritime life; also physical culture, sport, military science, etc., a thousandth part of which they could not learn in their whole life. But these things they do not try to learn, but give themselves up wholly to wrongdoing. They follow the philosophy of Epicurus,

and the indifferentism of the Cynics, and yet they boast that Jesus is their Master, who not only warned his followers against wrong deeds, but also against evil thoughts and words.

'And if they succeed in doing anything, it is by magic they do it, leading astray the weak and foolish by fraud. They confer no good upon those on whom they say they work miracles. But taking about with them young boys, and manifesting spectral apparitions that do not last a second, and by playing tricks upon people's sight,[1] they are shown to be like Simon Magus and not like Jesus Christ.'

II. 32. 4. 'And if they say our Lord did the same things by unreal manifestations, we can bring them to the prophecies and prove from them that all these things were so foretold of him, that they were actually done, and that he is the only Son of God. Wherefore, his true disciples receiving grace from him, perform cures in his name for the benefit of other men, according as each has received the gift. Others banish demons surely and truly, and frequently those who are delivered from such, become believers and are in the Church. Others have knowledge of the future, visions, and prophetic sayings. Others heal the sick by the laying on of hands, and restore them to health. And, as we have said, the dead have been raised and have remained with us many years. It is not possible to enumerate the graces which the Church throughout the whole world,[2] receiving from God in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified in the time of

[1] The chelas of the Buddhists, their conjuring tricks by hypnotic suggestion, and such manifestations as Katie King and a thousand other freaks of the séances will be recalled by these words. The trance revelations of Mrs. Piper and the physical manifestations of Eusapio Palladino, the Italian medium, were anticipated by their Gnostic forerunners.

[2] *i. e.* catholic or universal.

Pontius Pilate, performs each day for the assistance of the Gentiles, neither deceiving any nor taking any fee. As she has freely received, she freely gives. Nor does she anything by angelic invocations,[1] or incantations, or any morbid curiosity, but purely and openly, directing her prayers to the Lord who made all things, and invoking the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, she performs deeds of mercy for the advantage and not for the seduction of men. If even now the name of our Lord Jesus Christ confers benefits and most assuredly cures all who anywhere believe in him, and the name of no other has such influence, it is clear that he became man, and conversed with his creation, and truly did everything he did in the strength of God and according to the wish of the All-Father, as the prophets declared.'

[In the concluding chapters he discusses the doctrine of transmigration of souls, or, more properly speaking, of reincarnation (*metensomatosis*). This theory, he says, is overthrown by the fact that the soul does not remember anything of the previous states, but remembers the subjects of its dreams and visions which it has seen when the body was at rest. And by their system it would be necessary for the soul to remember all that they had left undone in previous existences if they were to go through every experience. He says that Plato [2] was the first to introduce this doctrine and employed a cup of oblivion, but so doing fell into a greater difficulty. The body itself does not necessarily cause oblivion. For what the prophets saw in the spirit

[1] Most probably he means evil spirits, but he includes good angels—otherwise he would have explained himself more fully, and put in a saving clause—as he proceeds to speak of prayers direct to God.

[2] Pindar, Pythagoras and Empedocles taught it long before. The Egyptians and Buddhists held this theory.

they were able to relate in the flesh; but the soul teaches the body and shares its spiritual visions with it.]

II. 33. 4. 'The body is not stronger than the soul from which it receives its breath, life, increase, and distinct expression; but the soul rules and governs the body. It is impeded just so far as it shares its movement with the body, but it does not lose its knowledge thereby. For the body is like an instrument, but the soul occupies the place of the artist. The artist conceives the movement swiftly, but performs it more slowly by reason of the immobility of his instrument. The speed of his thought blended with the slowness of his instrument produces a moderate movement. In the same way the soul is somewhat impeded in its communication to the body, its own speed being retarded by the slowness of the body. But it does not lose its powers altogether, for it does not cease to live because it gives life to the body. And of its other communications to it, it does not lose the knowledge nor the memory of things it has witnessed.'

[The soul had never a different body, but each of us has his own soul and his own body.]

II. 33. 5. 'For God is not so poor or lacking in resources that He cannot give its own soul to each body, as well as its own character. And when the number of mankind, as appointed before of God, has been reached, all those who are enrolled for life, having their own bodies and their own souls in which they pleased God, shall rise. And they who have deserved punishment shall depart to it, they too having their own souls and their own bodies in which they departed from the grace of God.'

II. 34. 1. 'Our Lord taught us that souls not only

last on [1] without passing into other bodies, but also retain the character of the body in which they are fitted, and that they remember the works which they did here and which they have ceased to do.'

[He refers to the parable of Dives and Lazarus, and then he argues that though souls have a beginning they have no end. The Greek philosophers believed that if the soul had future immortality it had also antecedent immortality. Because of this supposed pre-existence Plato invented his "cup of oblivion."]

II. 34. 2. 'Should any say that the souls which have recently begun to exist cannot last long, but should either be without birth if they are to be immortal, or if they have received a beginning must perish with the body, let him learn that God alone, the Lord of all, is without beginning and without end, and is truly always the same and in the same mode. But all things which have been made and are being made by Him have, indeed, a beginning of their creation, and on this account are inferior to Him who made them, because they are not without a beginning. But they last on and continue for a length of æons, according to the will of the Creator. For all things that have been made last just so long as God has willed them to exist. Life, accordingly, is not of us nor of our nature, but is given according to the grace of God. And so he who shall have preserved the gift of life, and given thanks to Him who bestowed it, shall receive a length of days for ever and ever. But he who shall reject it and prove ungrateful to the Creator, deprives himself of continuance for ever and ever, because he was created

[1] *perseverare*, by itself, cannot mean "last for ever." Irenæus seems to support the doctrine of conditional immortality.

and did not recognize the Giver. As our Lord said to ungrateful ones, "If you have not been faithful in a little, who will give you what is great?"[1] Meaning that they who have proved ungrateful to the Giver in a short temporal life will not receive from Him an unending existence (lit. a length of days for ever and ever).'

II. 34. 3. 'Just as the psychical body is not the soul, but shares in the soul, as far as God wishes, so the soul itself is not life, but shares in the life given it by God. This is the meaning of the prophetical saying about the protoplast, "He was made a living soul" (Gen. ii. 7). For the will of God must be supreme and dominant. All else must submit to it and be subservient to it.'

II. 35. 3. 'With our words agree the Preaching of the Apostles,[2] the teaching of our Lord, the announcement of the prophets, the utterances of the Apostles, and the ministration of the Law.'

[1] Luke xvi. 10, 11, with variations; cf. 2nd Epistle of Clement of Rome. Grabe conjectured it is from the Gospel according to the Egyptians.

[2] Probably the *Apostolic Preaching* of which "the Proof" was found in 1904 by two Armenian clergy in Erivan, and is frequently referred to in these notes.

BOOK III

PREFACE. 'My dear friend, I send you three books, the first of which contains an account of all the opinions of the heretics, and exposes their habits and their manner of life. In the second their false doctrines are laid bare and overthrown. In this, the third, I shall give you Scripture proofs in order that your request may be adequately answered, and that you may be fully able, with your own ideas and my arguments, to confute and defeat them.'

III. 1. 1. 'It was through those from whom the Gospel came to us that we have learnt the plan of our salvation. For what they preached they afterwards handed down[1] to us by the will of God in the Scriptures, to be "the foundation and pillar" of our faith.[2] It is not right to say that they preached before they had perfect knowledge, as some say, who boast that they are the revisers of the Apostles. For after our Lord rose from the dead, they were filled with the power of the Holy Spirit, who came upon them from above, and acquired perfect knowledge, and went to the ends of the earth proclaiming the good things we have from God, and announcing to men the heavenly peace. Matthew edited a writing of the Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome and founding the Church. After

[1] *tradiderunt*, whence *tradition*, matter handed down.

[2] 1 Tim. iii. 15: "The house (*familia*) of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of the truth."

their departure (death?) Mark, the pupil and interpreter of Peter, handed down to us in writing the things which were preached by Peter. And Luke the attendant of Paul recorded in a book the Gospel that was proclaimed by him.[1] Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, published the Gospel during his residence in Ephesus. And these all declared unto us the one God, the Maker of heaven and earth, and one Christ the Son of God. If any one does not agree with them, he spurns the fellow-workers of the Lord, he spurns our Lord Christ; nay, more, he spurns the Father, and is self-condemned, resisting and opposing his own salvation, as do all the heretics.'[2]

III. 2. 1. 'But when they are refuted by the Scriptures, they attack the Scriptures, declaring that they are wrong, and have no authority, and are inconsistent, and that the truth cannot be discovered in them by those who are ignorant of tradition. For it (the truth) was not handed down in writing, but by the living voice, they say. Each of them (Valentinus, Marcion, Cerinthus, Basilides) is altogether perverse and is not ashamed to preach his own gospel, corrupting the rule of the truth.'

III. 2. 2. 'And when, again, we appeal to that tradition which has come down to us from the Apostles, guarded by successions of presbyters[3] in the Churches, they oppose tradition, declaring

[1] Cf. the account of the Gospels given by Papias and quoted by Eusebius, *H.E.*, III. 39.

[2] Cf. damnatory clauses of *Quicunque Vult* (Athanasian Creed).

[3] The highest order in the Church, after the Apostles, in Apostolic times were the presbyters. The chief presbyters afterwards took the place of the Apostles, and in the course of a short time were distinguished by the title bishop, or overseer, from the other presbyters. Every bishop is a presbyter, but every presbyter is not a bishop.

that they are not only wiser than the presbyters, but also than the Apostles, and have found the pure and unadulterated truth. The Apostles, they say, blended legal requirements with the Saviour's words, and not only the Apostles but also the Lord himself at times spoke with a higher inspiration than at other times, whereas they without doubt, hesitation or confusion know the occult mystery. Thus they are equally opposed to Scripture and tradition. With such people, slippery as serpents, we have to contend.'

III. 3. 1. 'Any one who wishes to discern the truth may see in every Church in the whole world the Apostolic tradition clear and manifest. We can enumerate those who were appointed as bishops in the Churches by the Apostles and their successors to our own day, who never knew and never taught anything resembling their foolish doctrine. Had the Apostles known any secret mysteries, which they taught privately and *sub rosa* to the perfect, they would surely have entrusted this teaching to the men in whose charge they placed the Churches. For they wished them to be without blame and reproach to whom they handed over their own position of authority. But as it would be very long in a book of this kind, to enumerate the Episcopal lists in all the Churches, by pointing out the Apostolic tradition and creed, which has been brought down to us by a succession of bishops, in the greatest, most ancient, and well-known Church, founded by two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul at Rome, we can confute all those who in any other way, either for self-pleasing or vainglory, or blindness, or badness, hold unauthorized meetings. For with this Church, which holds a leading position[1] among the Churches,

[1] *potentior principalitas*, not ἀρχή, rule, but πρωτεῖον, pre-eminence; cf. 3 John 9, "Diotrephes, who loveth to have the pre-eminence," φιλοπρωτεύων. Some writers see in his

it is right that every Church—that is, the orthodox who are everywhere [1]—should agree, inasmuch as the Apostolic tradition is always preserved by the orthodox who are everywhere.' [2]

III. 3. 2. 'The blessed Apostles after founding and building up the Church entrusted the office of bishop to Linus. Paul speaks of this Linus in his Epistles to Timothy.[3] Anencletus followed him. After him, in the third place after the Apostles, Clement was appointed bishop. He not only saw the blessed Apostles, but also had intercourse with them, and had their preaching ringing in his ears and before his eyes. He was not alone in this, for there were still many left at the time who had been instructed by the Apostles. When Clement was bishop a great dissension arose in Corinth among the brethren, and the Church in Rome sent a powerful letter to the Corinthians, urging them to have peace, renewing their faith and announcing to them the tradition they had lately received from the Apostles. This was to the effect that there is one God Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, Creator of man, who brought in the deluge, called Abraham, led forth the

---

assumption of authority evidence of the monarchical episcopate! The Greek of this passage is missing. The order in the Voss. and Clerm. is Paul and Peter.

[1] The question is what *convenire* means, to *conform* or to *meet?* The previous word, *colligunt*, refers to meeting. But this would be a physical impossibility here.

[2] Cf. the Vincentian Canon. Vincent of Lerins, where this work of Irenæus was evidently read, in his *Commonitorium* written before 450 against the novelties of the heretics, lays down three tests of orthodoxy, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est* (cap. ii), i.e. *universitas, antiquitas, consensio*. Harvey says if *in qua* (*inasmuch as*) be "taken as the relative ἐν ᾗ, it can hardly refer to the Church of Rome; for how was the Apostolical tradition preserved in the Church of Rome by members of foreign churches?"

[3] 2 Tim. iv. 21.

people from the land of Egypt, spoke to Moses, appointed the Law, sent the prophets, and has prepared fire for the devil and his angels. That He, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, was proclaimed by the Churches any one who chooses may see from this writing,[1] which was before the time of these false teachers, who speak of another God above the Demiurge (Creator).'

III. 3. 3. 'Euarestos succeeded this Clement, and Alexander Euarestos, and then Sixtus, the sixth after the Apostles, was appointed. After him came Telesphorus, who had a glorious martyrdom. Then came Hyginus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter, and Eleutherus, the twelfth from the Apostles, now occupies the see.[2] In the same order and in the same succession the tradition of the Apostles in the Church and *the preaching*[3] *of the truth* has come down to us.'

III. 3. 4. 'And Polycarp was not only instructed in the faith by the Apostles, and personally acquainted with many who had seen the Lord, but he was also appointed by the Apostles for Asia as bishop in the Church at Smyrna. Him even I saw in my early youth. For he remained a long time with us and was exceedingly old. And after a glorious and conspicuous martyrdom[4] he passed away, having always taught these things which he learnt from the Apostles, which also the Church hands down and which alone are true. All the Churches throughout Asia, and the successors of Polycarp, a much more reliable and

[1] *scriptura* here is simply "writing." Irenæus calls the *Pastor* of Hermas (iv. 34) ἡ γραφή, the writing.

[2] κλῆρος (lot), whence *clergy;* cf. "The *lot* (κλῆρος) fell on Matthias," Acts i. 26. Eleutherus ruled 177–193.

[3] κήρυγμα. Note that Hyginus is the *ninth* bishop in I. 27. 1.

[4] The date of Polycarp's martyrdom is assigned to A.D. 155 by Lightfoot; by others to A.D. 167. Notice the words of Irenæus, which signify that Polycarp was made bishop over all Asia (the Roman province) as well as in Smyrna.

trustworthy witness of the truth than Valentinus and Marcion and other ill-disposed persons, add similar testimony.

'In the time of Anicetus, when staying in Rome, Polycarp converted many of these heretics to the Church of God, declaring that this was the one and only truth he had received from the Apostles, and this had been handed down to us by the Church. Some also heard him say that John, the disciple of our Lord, went into the baths in Ephesus, but, seeing Cerinthus inside, he rushed away from the baths, without bathing, and said, "Let us fly lest the baths fall, for Cerinthus the foe of the truth is within." And Polycarp himself on one occasion, when he met Marcion and he said, "Do you recognize[1] me?" answered, "I recognize you as the firstborn of Satan." So careful were the Apostles and their pupils to avoid even conversation with any of those who misrepresent[2] the truth, as Paul also said, "A heretic after the first and second[3] admonition avoid" (Titus iii. 10). There is also an excellent letter from Polycarp to the Philippians, from which they may learn the quality of his faith and *the preaching of the truth*,[4] who are willing and who care for their salvation.

'The Church in Ephesus, founded by Paul, and where John lived unto the days of Trajan,[5] is also a true witness of the tradition of the Apostles.'

III. 4. 1. 'Seeing that we have so many proofs, there is no need to seek among others for the truth which we can easily obtain from the Church. For the Apostles have brought fully and completely all

[1] Lit. "Do you know me?" Cf. Horace, *Serm.*, i. 9. 6. Numquid vis? . . . *noris* nos, inquit.

[2] Lit. mark with a wrong stamp.

[3] The Latin translation omits "and second." So the old Italic version. But in I. 13. 3 the Latin (Irenæus) has "et secundam."

[4] τὸ κήρυγμα, as before.

[5] A.D. 98.

the truth to her, lodging it with her as with a rich bank, so that any one who wishes may draw from her the draught of life. This is the entrance to life. But all others are thieves and robbers. Wherefore one must avoid them; but hold in the highest esteem the things of the Church, and learn the tradition of the truth. For if there was a question about any trifling matter, would it not be necessary to have recourse to the oldest Churches, in which the Apostles lived, and obtain from them some clear and definite ruling on the present subject of dispute? And if the Apostles had not even left us the Scriptures, would it not behove us to follow the order of tradition which they handed on to those to whom they entrusted the Churches? Many nations of barbarians who believe in Christ and have their salvation not written on paper with ink, but by the Spirit on their hearts, assent to this order, and carefully keep the old tradition, believing in one God the Maker of heaven and earth and of all therein, by Christ Jesus the Son of God. He, on account of his exceeding love for his creation, submitted to the birth from a virgin, and himself through himself uniting man with God, suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rising again was received in splendour. And is to come in glory as Saviour of those who are saved, and Judge of those who are judged, sending to eternal fire those who disfigure the truth and despise his Father and his own incarnation. They who hold this faith without writing may be barbarians as regards our language, but as regards opinions, habits and way of life are most wise on account of their faith. They also please God, living in all righteousness, pureness and wisdom. Should any one proclaim in their own language to them the inventions of the heretics they would run far away, shutting their ears, so as not even to hear such blasphemy. Thus they are kept

by that old Apostolic tradition from admitting even into their thoughts any of these monstrous doctrines. For they (the heretics) had no Church or form of doctrine.'

III. 4. 2. 'For before Valentinus there were none of his way of thinking, and before Marcion there were none of his. For Valentinus came to Rome in the days of Hyginus, flourished under Pius, and lived until Anicetus.[1] But Cerdon, who was before Marcion, also lived in the days of Hyginus, the eighth bishop. He often came to church and made his confession,[2] at one time teaching secretly and at another confessing openly, and at last being convicted of false teaching, he forsook the Christian congregation. Marcion, who succeeded him, flourished in the days of Anicetus, the tenth bishop.'

III. 5. 1. 'Since the Apostolic tradition is so regarded in the Church, and so remains with us, let us now return to the scriptural proof afforded by those who placed on record the Gospel preached by the Apostles. These worthless sophists say that the Apostles in a false and hypocritical[3] way made their teaching suit the capacity of the hearers, and adapted their answers to the opinions of the questioners, talking blind things with the blind according to their blindness, proclaiming the Demiurge to those who believed in him, and to those who hold the unnameable Father declaring in parables and enigmas the ineffable mystery. In this way, they say, our Lord and his

[1] Hyginus, A.D. 139; Pius, 142; Anicetus, 157.

[2] ἐξομολογούμενος, *exhomologesin faciens*. ἐξομολογία had special reference to the reciting of the Creed; notice how it is used as a contrast to *secret* teaching. The meaning of the modern phrase "make a confession" is different. Then Confession was a public act of contrition. See Tertullian, *On Penance* (c. 10), also Ambrose on same subject (ii. 10). Cf. James v. 16.

[3] *cum hypocrisi*; lit. with acting, playing a part.

Apostles taught their doctrine, not truthfully, but in a disingenuous manner, adapting it to the tastes of the hearers.'

III. 5. 2. 'But this is not the part of those who heal and give life, but rather of those who increase ignorance. For Apostles, who were sent to find the wandering, to give sight to those who did not see, and to heal the sick, surely did not adapt their conversation to the opinions held at the time by such people, but to the declaration of the truth. Nor would any people act rightly if they encouraged blind men on the very brink of destruction to continue their journey, saying that they were on the right road and would arrive in safety. And what medical man, when wishing to heal a patient, will be directed by the whims of the patient and not by the suitability of the medicine? And our Lord himself testifies to the fact that he came as a physician for the sick, saying, "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Luke v. 31, 32). How, then, are the sick to be strengthened? And how shall sinners repent? Is it by persevering in the same course; or, on the contrary, is it not by showing a great change and alteration of their previous life, which brought such illness and such sins upon them? But ignorance, the mother of all these things, is overcome by knowledge. Therefore the Lord informed his disciples how to heal the sick and how to wean the sinners from their sin. He did not, therefore, speak to men according to their previous opinions, nor did he make his replies suit their wishes, but he answered them with sound doctrine, without pretence and without personal favour. This is proved by our Lord's discourses. For he revealed the Son of God to the Jews, even him who was proclaimed as Messiah by the prophets. That is, he

manifested himself, who was to restore liberty to men, and give them the inheritance of incorruption. And, again, the Apostles taught the Gentiles to abandon worthless stocks and stones, which they imagined were gods, and to worship the true God who established and made the whole human race, and nourishes and sustains them by His creation, and grants them their existence. Also to expect His Son Jesus Christ, who redeemed us from the apostasy by his blood, in order that we might be a sanctified people, and shall descend from the heavens in the power of the Father, who is also to judge all men, and to give blessings to those who have kept His precepts. He appearing in the last times, as the head corner stone, has welded together and united both those who are far off and those who are nigh, that is, the circumcision and the uncircumcision, extending Japhet and placing him in the dwelling of Shem.' [1]

III. 6. 1. 'Neither the Lord, nor the Holy Spirit, nor the Apostles would have definitely and absolutely called him God who was not God; nor would they have addressed any one as Lord in his own person, save God the Father who rules everything, and His Son, who accepted from his Father the lordship of the whole creation, as it is written, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand." [2] . . . For it shows that the Father spoke with the Son, giving him the inheritance of the Gentiles and subduing his enemies before him. Since, then, the Father is truly Lord and the Son is truly Lord, the Holy Spirit addressed them by the name "Lord." Again, the passage, "And the Lord rained

[1] Eph. ii. 17; Gen. ix. 27. Irenæus reads Sem (whence Semitic) wrongly for Shem.

[2] Ps. cx. 1. Justin used this passage in the same way in the Dialogue with Trypho (p. 277); cf. Matt. xxii. 44; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Heb. i. 13; *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 85.

fire and sulphur from the Lord[1] from heaven" (Gen. xix. 24) refers also to the Son, who spoke to Abraham; and means that he received from the Father authority to judge the men of Sodom for their sins. Similarly, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever . . . therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee" (Ps. xlv. 6, 7). The Holy Spirit addressed both as God, both the Son who is anointed and the Father who anoints.[2] And again, "God stood in the congregation of the gods, in the midst He judges the gods"[3] (Ps. lxxxii. 1). This is said of the Father and of the Son and of those who have received the adoption. But these are the Church. For this is the congregation of God which God, that is the Son, gathered by himself. Of him, he says again, "The God of gods,[4] the Lord, hath spoken . . ." (Ps. l. 1). Who is this God? Surely he of whom he said, "Our God shall come manifestly"[5] (Ps. l. 3). This is the Son of whom he said, "I appeared openly to those who sought me not" (Isa. lxv. 1). But of what gods? Those to whom he says, "I said, Ye are gods and all the sons of the most High" (Ps. lxxxii. 6). That is said to those[6] who have received

[1] Cf. 2 Tim. i. 18: "The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord." This passage is also in *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 44.

[2] Cf. Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, p. 277. This passage is also cited with the same interpretation in Irenæus' *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 47.

[3] After LXX; so Vulg. The Hebrew means "God standeth in the assembly of God (or mighty assembly); in the midst of the *Elohim* (judges, see Exod. xxi. 6) He judges."

[4] Ps. l. 1. Lit. *El, Elohim*, Jahweh (the Lord, the Mighty God). Irenæus' explanation is again based on the LXX version, *θεὸς θεῶν*, which is wrong.

[5] After LXX.

[6] Irenæus follows LXX in wrong interpretation of *Elohim*, which means *judges* in Exod. xxi. 6; xxii. 8, 28. Hippolytus follows Irenæus, and addressing man says, "You have

the grace of adoption by which we cry "Abba, Father" (Rom. viii. 15).'

III. 6. 2. 'No other, then, is named or addressed as God save Him who is the God and Lord of all, who said to Moses, "I am that I am" (Exod. iii. 14). And Jesus Christ is His Son, who makes those who believe in his name sons of God. And, again, the Son spake to Moses, "I have come down to save this people" [1] (Exod. iii. 8). It is he himself who descended and ascended for the salvation of men. Through the Son, therefore, who is in the Father, and has the Father in himself, he who is, is revealed as God, the Father bearing witness to the Son and the Son declaring the Father.'

[Irenæus argues that it is only Jehovah that is described without qualification, *ex sua persona*, as God by the prophets. He concludes the chapter with a prayer for his readers.]

III. 6. 3. 'I therefore invoke Thee, Lord God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob and Israel, who art the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, God, who in the manifold nature of Thy mercy hast been graciously pleased that we should know Thee, who hast made the heaven and the earth, who rulest over all, who art the only true God, above whom there is no other God. Give through our Lord Jesus Christ

---

become God" (*θεός*). See Athanasius, *Orat.* I. 39: "He was God and became man to make us *gods*"; "We men are made gods by the Word, as being joined to Him through His flesh," *Orat.* III. 34, etc. Athanasius emphasized the deification of man.

[1] This passage is also quoted in the *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 46, and is referred to the Son, as here, in almost the same words. It seems strange that Exod. iii. 14 should be referred to the Father and Exod. iii. 8 to the Son. But he explains that the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father. Cf. "Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven."

the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Grant to every reader of this book to know Thee that Thou art the only God, to be strengthened in Thee, and to withdraw from every heretical, godless and impious opinion.'

[In the next chapter he points out that certain interpretations of St. Paul's writings, which he condemns, are due to wrong punctuation.]

III. 7. 1. 'They (the heretics) remark that Paul said in his second letter to the Corinthians: "In whom the God of this world-age hath blinded the minds of them that believe not" (2 Cor. iv. 4), asserting that the God of his world-age is one, and He who is above every principality, beginning and power is another. We are not to blame because they who say they know all mysteries do not know how to read Paul. But if any one will read the passage according to the style of Paul, who frequently used hyperbaton,[1] and make a slight emphasis and pause after "God," and then take the other words together so, "Of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving," he will see that what he meant to say was this, "God blinded the minds of the unbelieving of this world."' [2]

III. 7. 2. 'The Apostle frequently used this figure of hyperbaton on account of the velocity of his words and the impetuous force of the Spirit that was in him.'

[He instances Gal. iii. 19, where he gives the strange punctuation and reading, "What then of the law of works?" [3] saying that the clause "ordained

[1] That is, did not place his words in their natural order.

[2] See Tertullian, *c. Marc*, v. 11, who gives this explanation and then adds, "it would be simpler to identify 'the God of this world' with the Devil."

[3] *factorum* (πράξεων is found in no Greek MS.), found in St. Germain (ninth century) copy of the N.T.

by angels in the hand of a mediator" should be read at beginning of sentence. In 2 Thess. ii. 8 he says the clause "Whose coming is after the working of Satan" is out of place, and should follow the "Wicked one" and not the "Lord."

In the next chapter he discusses the meaning of Mammon in Matt. vi. 24, saying that it means in the speech of the Samaritans, covetous; but in Hebrew, gluttonous. And that the passage does not refer to another God.]

III. 8. 2. 'When he described the devil as "the strong one" (Matt. xii. 29) it was not in any absolute sense, but in comparison with us. For we were his goods and house when we were in apostasy; for he used us as he wished and the unclean spirit dwelt in us. He was not "strong" against him who bound him and plundered his house, but against those men who were in his employ, whom the Lord rescued. As Jeremiah says, "The Lord redeemed Jacob and rescued him from the hand of the stronger" (Jer. xxxi. 11).'

III. 8. 3. 'John, indeed, pointed out that all things, whether angels, archangels, thrones, or dominions, were created by Him who is God over all, and were made by His Word. But when he spoke of the Word of God being in the Father, he added, "All things were made by him and without him was nothing made" (John i. 3). David said, "He commanded and they were created" (Ps. cxlix. 5), "He spake and it was done" (Ps. xxxiii. 9). Whom did he, then, command? The Word, of course, "by whom," he says, "the heavens were made and all their power by the breath of his mouth" (Ps. xxxiii. 6). Very different are the things created from their Creator, and the things made from the Maker. For He is not made, and is without beginning or end, needing

nothing, being self-sufficing, and giving to every other thing the existence it has. But whatever has had a beginning may also suffer dissolution, and is subject to and needs Him who made them. It is absolutely necessary, then, that some distinction should be made between them, so that He who has made everything may be, with His Word, rightly called the only God and Lord, and the things which have been made may not share in this name.'

III. 9. 1. 'It has been, therefore, shown and will be shown again more clearly, that neither the prophets, nor the Apostles, nor the Lord Christ believed any other one to be Lord or God in his own Person save our God and Lord. John, the forerunner of Christ, preached repentance for sin, but not another God save Him who made the promise to Abraham, saying, "God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham" (Matt. iii. 9).'

[After quoting Luke iii. 4–6, concluding with the words "All flesh shall see the salvation of God," he says:] 'He, then, is one and the same God, the Father of our Lord, who promised through the prophets that He would send the forerunner. And He made His salvation, that is, His Word, visible to all flesh, through his very incarnation, so that he might be in all points manifestly their king.'

[Here follow three Messianic prophecies: Isa. vii. 14 (quoted from Matt. i. 23), also cited in III. 21. 4, and in Irenæus' *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 63; Ps. cxxxii. 10, 11, also cited in *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 64; and Num. xxiv. 17, "A star shall arise from Jacob and a leader will rise in Israel," also cited in *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 58.[1]]

[1] The fact that these prophecies are quoted so frequently together by Irenæus shows that he had some written list of such Scripture proofs to his hand, probably made out by Justin and other earlier teachers.

'He, then, is one and the same God, who was proclaimed by the prophets, announced by the Gospel. And it is His Son who was born of the fruit of the body of David, that is, of the Virgin of David, and is Emmanuel. Whose star Balaam prophesied would rise.'

III. 9. 2. [Discussing Matthew's account of the Magi's visit, he says that they showed by the gifts they offered who it was that was worshipped.]

'"Myrrh" they gave, because it was he who should die and be buried for the mortal race of men; gold, because he was a king of "*whose kingdom there should be no end*" (Luke i. 33); frankincense, because he was God and "was known in Judah" (Ps. lxxvi. 1), and was made manifest to them who sought him not (Isa. lxv. 1).'

[Referring to Matthew's account of his baptism, (Matt. iii. 16 f.) he says:] 'Christ did not, then, descend upon Jesus, nor was Christ one and Jesus another. But it is the Word of God, who is the Saviour of all, and the ruler of heaven and earth, who is Jesus, who took our humanity upon him (lit. assumed flesh), and was anointed by the Spirit from the Father, as Esaias says.' [Here follows Isa. xi. 1 f. and lxi. 1 f., with some variations.[1]]

'In accordance with the fact that the Word of God became man of the root of Jesse and a Son of Abraham, the Spirit of God rested upon him, and he was anointed to preach the Gospel to the meek. But, in accordance with the fact that he was God, he did not judge according to opinion, nor reprove according

[1] *Secundum gloriam* (LXX, δόξαν), Isa. xi. 2, for "according to the sight of his eyes," and *caecis visionem* after LXX, Isa. lxi. 1, for "opening of prison to the bound." δόξα was used in the sense of "opinion."

to gossip.[1] "For he had no need that any should give testimony of men to him,[2] since he knew what was in man" (John ii. 25). But he called all the mourners, and granting remission to those who were led captive by their sins he released them from their bonds, of which Solomon said, "Each one is holden with the cords of his sins" (Prov. v. 22). Therefore the Spirit of the Lord descended upon him, the Spirit of Him who had promised through the prophets to anoint him, so that we receiving of the abundance of his unction might be saved.'

[In the next chapter he quotes Scripture proofs from Luke to show that he only recognized as "simply, absolutely and surely God and Lord in His own Person" the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.]

'And of the Lord he said, "He will be great and will be called the son of the highest, and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David: and he will reign in the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i. 32 f.). What other is he who reigns in the house of Jacob without ceasing for ever but Christ Jesus our Lord, the Son of God most High? He promised, through the Law and the prophets, that He would make His salvation visible to all flesh, so that he (the Son) became the Son of man for this, that man might become the Son of God.'

III. 10. 2. 'The same God (who spoke to the fathers and gave the Law through Moses) in accordance with His great goodness poured out His mercy upon us, in which mercy "the Day-spring from on high hath

[1] Heb.: "He shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears." Irenæus follows the LXX, λαλιάν (*loquelam*).

[2] ei is found in the Clerm. and Voss. MSS. See also Syriac.

visited us" (Luke i. 78), as Zacharias said when recovering from his dumbness, which he had suffered on account of his unbelief, and filled with a new spirit blessed God in a new way. For all things were new, when the Word in a new way arranged for his coming in the flesh, so that he might win back to God the men that had departed from God. Accordingly, they were taught to worship God in a new way and not another God, "for it is the one God who justifies the circumcision which is of faith and the uncircumcision which is through faith" (Rom. iii. 30). [Here follows the *Benedictus*.] "To give knowledge of salvation to his people for the remission of their sins." For this knowledge of salvation which they lacked was the knowledge of the Son of God, which John gave, saying, "Behold the lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world" (John i. 29). "And of his *fullness*[1] have we all received" (John i. 16). This, then, is the knowledge of salvation, not another God, nor another Father, nor Bythus, nor the Pleroma of the thirty æons, nor the Mother of the Ogdoad, but the knowledge of the Son of God, who is both Salvation and Saviour and Saving.[2] He is Saviour, since he is Son and Word of God; Saving, since He is Spirit, for he says, "the Spirit of our face,"[3] Christ the Lord; Salvation, because he was flesh. For the Word became flesh and dwelt among us.'

[Passing on to Luke's Gospel he quotes the angels' hymn, *Gloria in excelsis*, with the reading "Pax

[1] πλήρωμα, the word which was in such use among the Gnostics.

[2] Salus, Salvator, Salutare. Irenæus quotes Gen. xlix. 18, Isa. xii. 2, Ps. xcviii. 2 for these words.

[3] Lam. iv. 20, also in *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 71. The Hebrew means "the breath of our nostrils." Justin quoted the passage, *Apol.* I. 55, as "breath before our face." Irenæus took πνεῦμα to be "Spirit."

hominibus bonae voluntatis" Luke ii. 14 (εὐδοκιάς), and the *Venite* (Ps. xcv. 4), "Come, let us worship and fall down and weep" (*ploremus* = κλαύσωμεν, the Hebrew words for "weep" and "kneel" being similar) "before the Lord our Maker. For He is our Lord God." Irenæus adds "Dominus."]

'The Holy Spirit openly declares to those who hear him, by David, that there will be people who shall despise Him, who made us and who is the only God; showing distinctly that there is no other God either besides or above Him, to whom we ought to give more heed; and training our hearts to be religious and grateful to Him who made, established, and nourishes us.'

[He quotes passages from SS. Luke and Mark to show that the Father of our Lord is addressed as God. In quoting Mark i. 3 he read θεοῦ for αὐτοῦ, "Make straight the paths before our God." So Origen, *C. Cels.* II. So Hebrew, LXX, Vulg. of Isa. xl. 3.]

III. 10. 6. 'Thus it is one and the same God and Father who was announced by the prophets, revealed by the Gospel, whom we Christians worship and love with our whole heart, and who is the Maker of heaven and earth and of all things therein.'

III. 11. 1. 'John the disciple of the Lord declared this belief, wishing to confute by his Gospel the error which was spread by Cerinthus and before him by the Nicolaitans, a branch of the falsely named science,[1] and to show that there is one God who made all things by His Word, and not as they assert, who hold that Creator was different from the Father of our Lord; that the Son of the former was different from the Upper Christ who remained impassible, but who descended upon Jesus the Son of the Creator,

[1] Cf. Christian Science.

and again returned to his Pleroma. Also they say that *Monogenes* (Only-begotten) was the *arche* (beginning); but that Logos was the true son of the Only-begotten, and that this world of ours was not made by the principal deity, but by a certain power cast down and cut off from all communication with the invisible world. Eager to destroy such teaching, and to establish in the Church the rule of truth that there is one God Almighty who made all things visible and invisible by His Word, he thus began his Gospel teaching: "In the beginning was the Word. All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made. That which was made in him was life."'[1]

[He now proceeds to give a summary of the various heresies on the Virgin-birth.]

III. 11. 3. 'According to them, neither the Word nor Christ nor their "Saviour" was made flesh. They hold that neither the Word nor the Christ ever entered this world, that the Saviour never really became incarnate or suffered, but that he descended as a dove upon that Jesus who belonged to the dispensation, and then when he had proclaimed the unknown Father, he again ascended into the Pleroma. Some, indeed, assert that this dispensational Jesus,[2] whom they say passed through Mary as water through a tube, became incarnate and suffered. Others, again, declare that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, and that the Christ of the upper realms, being without flesh and the capacity

[1] This is probably the correct punctuation; it is followed by Tertullian, Origen, Hilary, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril, Augustine, Jerome, and has MSS. A and D, etc., to support it.

[2] The body of this dispensational Jesus is described in I. 9. 3 as psychical, but fashioned in so wonderful a manner that it could be seen and felt. This was the Docetic view afterwards adopted by Apollinarius in a modified form.

of suffering, descended upon him. But according to no school of the Gnostics did the Word of God become incarnate. For if any one examines their "rules," he will find that the Word of God is represented in them all as without humanity and the capacity to suffer. Some regard his manifestation as that of a transfigured man, neither born nor incarnate. Others hold that he did not, indeed, assume the figure of a man, but as a dove descended upon Jesus who was born of Mary.'

[The Son reveals the Creator as Father.]

III. 11. 5. 'Good is that wine which was made from the vine which was created by God. But better is that which, by a summary[1] process, was converted from water at the feast. Although the Lord could supply wine to the guests and food to the hungry without any natural material, he did not do this, but taking the loaves which came from the earth, and giving thanks, and using the water for the wine, he satisfied those who sat down and those at the wedding feast; showing that the God who made the earth and commanded it to bear fruit, and made the waters, in these last times by His Son gives the blessing of food and the grace of drink to the human race, the Incomprehensible One acting through the Comprehensible and the Invisible by the Visible. Although he does not exist apart from God, but in the bosom of the Father. Wherefore they know Him (the Father) to whom the Son revealed Him; and again the Father through the Son gives the knowledge of His Son to those who love Him.'

[1] *compendialiter*. This word throws light on the miracle. The Lord, as it were, changes water into wine every year in the vineyard. He changed it so once by a summary process at the marriage feast. He who multiplied a few loaves to satisfy the starving multitudes raises the seed corn into a harvest every year. Cf. compendii poculo, III. 16. 6.

III. 11. 6. 'These are the principles of the Gospel which declares that there is one God, the Maker of this Universe, who was announced by the prophets, and is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and knows of no other God or Father beside Him. So great and firm is the reputation of the Gospels that even the heretics testify to them, and starting from them attempt to establish their doctrines. For the Ebionites use only the Gospel according to Matthew, but their false teaching is refuted by it. Marcion employs a truncated copy of the Gospel according to Luke, and is proved to be a blasphemer against the Only God by the passages he retains. They who separate [1] Jesus from the Christ, and say that Jesus suffered, but Christ was incapable of suffering, prefer the Gospel according to Mark, by which their views may be corrected. But the school of Valentinus, who borrow most freely from the Gospel according to John to prove their "conjunctions," will be proved by it to say nothing rightly.'

[Irenæus gives certain mystical reasons, that recall the *Shepherd* of Hermas, for the fact that there are four Gospels. The organic unity of the Gospels, he says, is assured because "they are held together by one Spirit." But its "fourfold form" (τετράμορφον) corresponds to the four quarters of the heaven, the four principal winds, the "four-visaged" (τετραπρόσωπα) Cherubim, "whose faces are symbols of the operation

[1] The four principal heresies regarding Christ are to a certain extent self-destructive. Against Arius, Apollinarius, Nestorius and Eutyches, who denied respectively the true Godhead, the perfect manhood, the indivisible union and the absolute distinctness of Godhead and manhood in Christ, the Church declared he was "truly" (ἀληθῶς) God in Nicæa 325, "perfectly" (τελέως) man in Constantinople 381, "indivisibly" (ἀδιαιρέτως) God-man in Ephesus 431, "distinctly" (ἀσυγχύτως) God and man at Chalcedon 451. The Personality is Divine. See Art. II.

of the Son of God," and the four Catholic (universal) covenants (Noah's, Abraham's, Moses', Christ's) given to mankind. See also Ezekiel i. 10.]

III. 11. 8. 'From this it is clear that the Word, the architect of all things, who is seated on the Cherubim and holds together all things, when manifested to man gave us the four-formed Gospel. For the first living creature was like a lion, a symbol of his energy, leadership and royalty. The second was like a calf, an emblem of his sacrificial and sacerdotal order. The third had the face of a man, which is a very distinct description of his appearance among us. While the fourth was like a flying eagle, which signifies the gift of the Spirit, who descends as in flight upon the Church. The Gospels were in harmony with these types; for upon them the Christ is enthroned. The Gospel according to John explains his regal and glorious generation from the Father, saying, "In the beginning was the Word," and "all things were made by Him; and without Him was nothing made." But the Gospel according to Luke, seeing that it is of a priestly character, commenced with Zacharias the priest offering sacrifice to God. For now was the fatted calf being prepared which was to be sacrificed for the recovery of the younger son. Matthew, again, records his human generation, beginning, "A book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham." This is the Gospel of his humanity. But Mark commences with the prophetic Spirit, which came down from on high to men, saying, "A beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it is written in Isaiah the prophet," thus showing forth the winged figure of the Gospel. Accordingly he wrote his Gospel in a condensed and cursory form, for that is the prophetical style. Now the Word of God Himself was

wont to converse in all His divine glory with the patriarchs before Moses. But for those under the Law He appointed a sacerdotal ministry. Afterwards, having become man, He sent forth the gift of His Holy Spirit into all the world, placing us under the shadow of His wings. The system of the Son of God is thus represented by the form of the living creatures. And the character of the Gospel corresponds therewith, for, as the living creatures were four in form, the Gospel of the Lord has four aspects, and His work four stages. Therefore, four Catholic covenants were given to mankind. The first, Noah's, was that of the rainbow after the Flood; the second, Abraham's, being that of the Circumcision. The third was the giving of the Law in the time of Moses; and the fourth is that of the Gospel given through our Lord Jesus Christ.'

III. 11. 9. 'Since this is so, they are foolish who introduce either more or fewer forms of the Gospel in order to pretend that they have discovered more than the truth, or in the desire to set aside the dispensations of God. For Marcion, who rejects the whole Gospel, boasts that he has a share in it. Others,[1] in order to oppose the gift of the Spirit, which in these last times was poured out upon the human race according to the pleasure of the Father, do not accept that form of the Gospel, which is according to John, in which the Lord promised to send the Paraclete. But at the same time they reject both the Gospel and the prophetic Spirit. Unhappy, indeed, are those who wish to be false

[1] The Montanists, who claimed the gift of prophecy as their special property. They called the Church people *psychici*, themselves *pneumatici* (spiritual). They rejected the Gospel of St. John because of the promise of the Paraclete, which was, they held, the special property of Montanus. See Tertullian, *Praescr. Haer.* 52.

prophets, but who deny that the Church has the grace of prophecy. They act similarly to those who abstain from communion with the brotherhood on account of the hypocrites in it.[1] People of this kind would even reject the Apostle Paul. For in his letter to the Corinthians he spoke distinctly of prophetic gifts, and knew of men and women who prophesied in the Church. In all these points, sinning against the Spirit of God, they fall into the unpardonable sin. But the people of Valentinus, without any hesitation, put forward their own writings and boast that they are more in number than the Gospels. Indeed, they have reached such a pitch of audacity that they have named a recent writing of their own "the Gospel of Truth," although it does not at all agree with the Gospels of the Apostles.'

[He proceeds to quote passages from St. Peter and the other Apostles in the Acts in confirmation of the foregoing argument, and says:]

III. 12. 5. 'These are the voices[2] of that Church from which every Church had its origin. These are the voices of the mother city of the citizens of the New Testament. These are the very voices of the Apostles. These are the voices of the disciples of the Lord, the really "perfect" ones, who were perfected after the Assumption,[3] and who called upon

[1] This is illustrated by the action of the Plymouth Brethren (Darbyites). They left the Church because of its bad members, they said. They immediately proceeded to excommunicate each other and form "exclusive" little sects in their insignificant community, proving that they had not got rid of hypocrites when they set up their select brotherhood.

[2] Acts iv. 24–26. *φωναί*, more emphatic than the word *λόγοι*.

[3] *ἀνάληψις*, after *ἀναληφθείς* (Acts i. 11), who was taken up into heaven, and *ἀνελήφθη* (Mark xvi. 19). Irenæus frequently speaks of the *Assumption* of Christ.

God who made the heaven and earth and sea, who was proclaimed by the prophets, and His Son, whom God anointed. For in those days there was no Valentinus, nor Marcion, nor other destroyers of themselves and their followers. Therefore, God the Creator heard them; "for the place," he says, "was shaken in which they were gathered, and all were filled with the Holy Spirit, and spake the word of God with boldness to every one who was willing to believe." And he says, "Every day in the temple and in their home they ceased not to teach and preach Christ Jesus the Son of God." For this was the knowledge of salvation which make those perfect towards God who understand the Advent [1] of His Son.'

[He confutes the opinion that the Apostles adapted their teaching about God to the opinions of the people.]

III. 12. 6. 'But since some have the hardihood to say that the Apostles when preaching among the Jews could not proclaim any other God but Him who was the object of their faith, we answer that if the Apostles adapted their teaching to the already implanted opinions of men, no one learnt the truth from them, but long before from the Lord. According to their argument, no one was allowed to have the "rule of truth"; but all the disciples imparted such instruction as their hearers were pleased to accept, or were able to understand. But the incarnation of our Lord will seem superfluous if he just came to safeguard the previous ideas people had of God. And it will seem much more difficult that he whom the Jews knew as man and nailed to the cross should be announced as Christ the Son of God, their own

[1] *i. e.* his *carnalis adventus,* or Incarnation.

eternal King. They did not, therefore, speak according to the already conceived opinions of men.'

III. 12. 7. 'From the words of Peter to Cornelius and his friends, the Gentiles to whom he first spoke about God, we learn the kind of announcements the Apostles made, the character of their preaching, and their opinion about God. The heavenly voice reminded Peter in his vision that the God Cornelius worshipped cleansed the Gentiles by the blood of His Son, clearly showing that the God whom Cornelius feared, whom he had heard of through the Law and the prophets (*i. e.* the Jews), through whom also he made his alms, is in very truth God. But what he lacked was the knowledge of the Son.'

[He quotes Peter's sermon on Christ, Acts x. 37–44.]

'The Apostles therefore announced the Son of God who was unknown to men, and his incarnation to those who had been previously instructed in the knowledge of God. But they did not introduce another God. For had Peter known anything of such, he could have freely preached to the Gentiles (with Cornelius) that there was one God of the Jews and another of the Gentiles, for they were all so frightened by the vision of the angel that they would have believed anything. But it is clear from Peter's words that he safeguarded the God already known to them, and he testified to them that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, the Judge of the quick and the dead, into whom he bade them be baptized for the remission of sins. He also testified that Jesus himself is the Son of God who was anointed by the Holy Spirit, and is called Jesus Christ. He was also born of Mary, as Peter's testimony implies. Or was it possible that Peter had not then the perfect knowledge which these afterwards obtained? According to these people, Peter was imperfect, and the other

Apostles were imperfect, and they must come to life again and become the disciples of these men if they, too, wish to be perfect. But this is too absurd a proposition.'

[He refers to Philip's witness to the eunuch, saying that he preached "the One God who was announced by the prophets, and that His Son had already come in the form of man, and was led as a sheep to the slaughter" (Acts viii. 32; Isa. liii. 7, 8). He says of Paul that "this is the mystery which he says was made known by revelation to him, that he who suffered under Pontius Pilate is the Lord of God, King and God and Judge." He quotes in full St. Paul's sermon to the Athenians on the God of nature and humanity (Acts xvii. 24–32), and also that to the Lycaonians on the living God who made heaven and earth, and His loving providence.]

III. 12. 9. 'With these declarations all his epistles agree, as we shall show in the proper place when discussing the Apostle. And as I work up these proofs which are based on the Scriptures, and set forth briefly and summarily the things that are said in many and various places, do you give me your kind attention, and do not think me long-winded, for you are aware that the proofs which are in the Scriptures cannot be shown but by quotations from the Scriptures.'

[He cites the remarks of Stephen (Acts vii. 2–8), "the first martyr slain on account of the confession of Christ."]

III. 12. 11. 'Those who wish may learn from the very addresses and Acts of the Apostles that they all maintained that the God who led Abraham into Canaan and gave him the covenant of circumcision is the Maker of all things and the Father of our

Lord Jesus Christ, the God of glory. Should any one think that what the Apostles have said about God is to be taken as allegory, let him read our previous discourses, and when he has rejected such an erroneous opinion, he will be reasonable and recognize that the Law of Moses and the grace of the New Testament were both adapted to their times, and were given by one and the same God for the benefit of the human race.'

III. 12. 12. 'But all badly disposed people, who hold that the Mosaic legislation is different from and contrary to the doctrine of the Gospel, have not attended to the reasons of the differences of the Testaments. Abandoned, therefore, by the Father's love, and puffed up by Satan, they have turned over to the views of Simon Magus, and in their beliefs have departed from Him who is God. They imagine that they have discovered something more than the Apostles, that the Apostles had still Jewish sentiments when preaching their Gospel, but say that they are more wise and unbiased than the Apostles. Accordingly, Marcion and his people have turned to cutting up the Scriptures, not recognizing some at all, and, abridging the Gospel according to Luke and the Pauline Epistles, only regard as genuine what they have left.[1] I hope, with the grace of God, to confute them out of the remnants which they accept in another work.[2] Others, inflated with the false name of Science,[3] admit the Scriptures indeed, but mis-

[1] Marcion rejected the Pastoral Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, the Revelation of John. He began his version of the third Gospel at Luke iii. 1, omitting the pedigree, vv. 24–38, and rejected the other gospels.

[2] This contemplated work is referred to by Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 8. Tertullian did what Irenæus was unable to do.

[3] See note, p. 100. Christian Science is said to be neither Christian nor Science.

interpret them.[1] The sect of Marcion hold that there are two Gods, mutually opposed, one good, the other bad and the author of evil, that is our Creator. But Valentinus, though he gives the three honourable names of Father, Lord and God to the Creator, has a more blasphemous system. This is all due to ignorance of the Scriptures and the Divine plan. I shall set forth the reason of the difference of the Testaments, and also their unity and harmony, in future writings.'

III. 12. 13. 'Both the Apostles and their disciples taught what the Church preaches, and so teaching were made "perfect"; wherefore they were called forth to him who is perfected.[2] Stephen when teaching this doctrine, though still upon earth, beheld the glory of God and Jesus on His right hand, and said, "Behold, I see the heavens open and the Son of man standing at the right hand of God" (Acts vii. 56). After saying this he was stoned to death, and thus fulfilled the perfect teaching, in the details of his martyrdom following his master, and imploring pardon for those who were killing him, and saying, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge" (Acts vii. 60). Thus they were made perfect, who knew the One and the same God, from the beginning to the end, to be helping the human race by His various dispensations. How can they have adapted their teaching to the theological opinions of their hearers, who gave up their lives to death for the gospel of Christ? Had they done so they had not suffered. But it was because they opposed those who would not accept the truth that they suffered. To the

[1] Cf. Mrs. Eddy's *Key to the Scriptures*, an amazing "farrago." See also note on p. 26.

[2] Christ, ὁ τελειωθείς (Heb. v. 9); "just men made perfect" (Heb. xii. 23). This is a reference to the Hebrews, which is not directly quoted by Irenæus.

Jews they declared, with every confidence, that that Jesus who was crucified by them is the Son of God, the Judge of the living and dead, and has received the eternal Kingdom in Israel; but to the Greeks they preached the One God who made all things and His Son Jesus Christ.'

[He quotes the Apostolic speeches and letter of Acts xv. about the difficulty that had arisen between the Jewish teachers and the Gentile converts. It is clear from all this, he says, that they gave a new Testament of liberty to those who newly believed in God by the Spirit.[1]]

III. 12. 14. 'Nor would they have had such reverence for the first Testament as to refuse to eat with Gentiles if they thought otherwise. For Peter, although sent to instruct [2] them and constrained by such a vision to do so, spoke with much hesitation to them: "You know that it is not right for a Jew to consort with or have intercourse with strangers" (Acts x. 28, 29), signifying that he would not have come had he not been ordered. Perhaps he would not have given them baptism had the Holy Spirit not rested upon them and he heard them prophesying [3] (Acts x. 45, 46).'

III. 12. 15. 'Those Apostles who were with James permitted the Gentiles to act freely in this matter, committing us to the Spirit of God. But they persisted in their old customs, and Peter, although he ate with Gentiles on account of the vision and

[1] There are some interesting variants in the Latin here, similar to the readings of Codex Bezae, *e.g.* "ambulantes in Spiritu sancto" (the Greek ἔῤῥωσθε means "farewell"), "walking in the Holy Spirit."

[2] *ad catechizandos eos. Catechism* was always the term for oral instruction in the Church. Cf. Luke i. 4.

[3] This is Irenæus' interpretation of the passage: "They heard them speak with tongues and glorify God" (Acts x. 46).

because the Holy Spirit rested upon them, when certain from James came, he separated himself to avoid blame. So testify Paul and Barnabas. Thus the Apostles, Peter, James and John, whom our Lord made witnesses of his every act and teaching, for they are always said to be present with him, showed respect for the Law of Moses, showing that it is from one and the same God as the New.'

[He answers those like Marcion who hold that Paul alone knew the truth.]

III. 13. 1. 'Let Paul himself confute those [1] who say that Paul alone knew the truth. Peter was the Apostle of the same God as Paul was. And he whom Peter preached among the circumcision as God and the Son of God, Paul declared him among the Gentiles. For our Lord did not come to save Paul alone, nor was God so poor that He had only one Apostle who knew the economy of His Son. And Paul himself said, including all who had seen the Lord after his resurrection, "Whether it were I or they, so we preach and so ye believed" (1 Cor. v. 11).'

III. 13. 2. 'And our Lord said to Philip when wishing to see the Father, "Have I been so long time with you and hast thou not known me, Philip? He who sees me, sees the Father also. How sayest thou then, Show us the Father? For I am in the Father and the Father in me, and you have both known Him and seen Him" (John xiv. 7–10). To say, then, that these men to whom our Lord bare witness that they both knew and saw the Father in himself—and the Father is truth—knew not the

[1] According to Pfleiderer in *Hibbert Lectures*, and Harnack in *What is Christianity?*, the Messianic movement would not have become the universal religion of Christendom without Paul. On the Tübingen theory Christianity would have been a failure but for Paul. These people have followed in Marcion's steps.

truth, is the part of false witnesses, of men alienated from the teaching of Christ. How could Peter, to whom the Lord bare witness that flesh and blood had not revealed it to him, but the Father who is in heaven (Matt. xvi. 17), be ignorant of it? Likewise also "Paul an Apostle, not of men, nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father" (Gal. i. 1). For the Son led them to the Father, but the Father revealed the Son to them.'

III. 13. 3. 'Paul also went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas that the liberty of the Gentiles might be confirmed. "Then, fourteen years after, I went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus with me. I went up by revelation, and I communicated with them the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles" (Gal. ii. 1, 2). And, again, he said, "For the hour we yielded by subjection that the truth of the Gospel may abide among you"[1] (Gal. ii. 5). If any one will examine with care the chronology in the Acts of the Apostles with respect to these years he will find that it harmonizes with this statement. Accordingly, the announcement of Paul agrees with Luke's testimony regarding the Apostles.'

[In the next chapter he discusses the "we" clauses (Acts xvi. 3 f., 13; xx. 5, etc.) in the Acts, which he assigns to St. Luke. He mentions the details of St. Paul's journey and shipwreck, and also gives in detail a number of things connected with the Gospel which have been recorded by Luke alone.]

III. 14. 1. 'That this Luke was Paul's inseparable companion and fellow-worker in the Gospel he tells

[1] Notice omission of negative. Tertullian (*c. Marc.* v. 3) also argues as if the negative were omitted. "Would they have yielded if there were not false brethren? I trow not. They yielded because there were parties on whose account they had to yield." The St. Germain MS. agrees. But the Greek MSS. have οὐδέ.

us, not to boast, but because he was led to do so by the truth. That he was not only the attendant, but also the colleague, of the Apostles, but chiefly of Paul, Paul himself showed in his letters: "Luke alone is with me." "Luke, the beloved physician, salutes you." [1] If, then, Luke, who always preached with Paul, and is called "beloved" by him, and shared in his evangelistic work, and is believed to have recorded the Gospel for us, learnt nothing different from him, as we have shown, how can those who never were joined to Paul boast that they learnt abstruse and unspeakable mysteries [2] from him?'

III. 14. 2. 'Paul shows us clearly that he taught what he knew simply and without reserve, not only to his companions, but to all who heard him. In Miletus, when he had called together the *bishops and presbyters* [3] from Ephesus and the other neighbouring cities, when on his way to Jerusalem, he said, "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed, therefore, to yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy Spirit hath *appointed* you as bishops,[4] to *rule* the church of God which he hath founded for himself by his own blood" [5]

[1] 2 Tim. iv. 11; Col. iv. 14.

[2] The Latin *sacramenta* frequently means μυστήρια.

[3] Notice that Irenæus inferred from the mention of bishops in v. 28 that there were bishops present as well as presbyters. We can imagine St. Paul turning from the presbyters to address their leaders, who were probably called "bishops" or "overseers."

[4] The Latin *praeposuit* Episcopos (Vulg. has *posuit*, Greek ἔθετο) emphasizes the fact that they were exalted in rank and rule above the others. This is also brought out by *regere* (Greek ποιμαίνειν).

[5] *sibi constituit*. The idea of *purchase* was foreign to Irenæus' view of the Atonement. "Purchase from whom?" he would say. The Greek περιεποιήσατο (acquired) does not suggest "purchase," but "acquisition." Vulg. acquisivit.

(Acts xx. 27–28). Thus the Apostles simply and ungrudgingly imparted everything they had learnt from the Lord to all.'[1]

III. 14. 3. 'Should any one, then, set aside Luke as ignorant of the truth, it is clear that he is rejecting the Gospel of which he claims to be a disciple. For we have learnt through him very many essential details of the Gospel, such as the pedigree of John (Baptist), the history of Zacharias, the coming of the angel to Mary, and the utterance[2] of Elisabeth. [After enumerating many other important features of his Gospel, he says:] And many other things have been said by Luke alone of which both Marcion and Valentinus make use.'

[In the next chapter he answers those[3] who reject St. Paul.]

III. 15. 1. 'We say the same things to those who do not recognize Paul as an Apostle, for they must either reject the remainder of the Gospel which has come to us through Luke alone, or if they receive it all, they must also receive his testimony regarding Paul, that the Lord spoke to him at first from heaven: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? I am Jesus Christ whom thou persecutest" (Acts xxii. 8), and then said to Ananias regarding him: "Go, for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name among the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel." Those who reject him who was so chosen

[1] There was no *disciplina arcani* then.

[2] This was doubtless the *Magnificat*. In IV. 7. 1 the Clermont and Voss MSS. of the treatise and the newly discovered Armenian version assign the *Magnificat* to Elisabeth.

[3] The Ebionites regarded Paul as an apostate from the Law. See I. 26. 2. They only used the Gospel of St. Matthew, adhered to Jewish rites and ceremonies, and held that Jesus was the Son of Joseph.

by God despise the divine election [1] and separate themselves from the Apostles' communion. It was perhaps for this reason that the Lord caused that many Gospel matters, which every one must use, should be recorded by Luke, in order that all who follow his subsequent testimony regarding the acts and teaching of the Apostles, and hold the rule of truth without adulteration, might be saved. Therefore his testimony is clear, and the teaching of the Apostles is manifest and sure. There is nothing withheld, nor do they teach one thing in secret and another thing in public.'

III. 15. 2. 'For that is the scheme of false and evil seducers like the followers of Valentinus. For they, on account of the Church people whom they call "common" [2] and "ecclesiastics," give addresses calculated to deceive and to entrap the unwary by imitating our style of preaching so as to get a more frequent hearing. And they complain of us that, though they entertain the same views as we do, we without any reason abstain from fellowship with them, and although they use the same formulæ and hold the same doctrine,[3] we call them heretics.

[1] *Dei electio* shows that there is an election to work and office as well as to salvation and grace.

[2] Communes. Harvey suggests that this represents καθολικούς, Catholics. The word *catholicus* is used by Tertullian in the sense of "general," or "public." When used of the *bonitas* of God it means "universal." See *Adv. Marc.* II. 17. Its correlative is *ex parte* in *De Fug.* 3. In Aristotle (?), as the "general" it is opposed to the "particular." It may have been used for the general Church as distinguished from local or national Churches. The name cannot be given to any Church that is heretical in its views, has introduced novelties into its doctrine, or rejected the discipline and ministry of the Church. See Prof. Swete's book, *The Catholic Church.* The heretics use it as a term of contempt for the "general," οἱ πολλοί. Cf. "Caviare for the *general*" (Hamlet.)

[3] See Preface to Book I: "Saying the same things, but thinking differently."

And when they have seduced any persons from their Faith by the questions which they suggest, and have made them willing hearers, they impart to them, in private, "the unspeakable mystery of their Pleroma." All are deceived who take their plausible arguments for Gospel. For error is specious, plausible, and seeketh pretences. But the truth is without pretence, and therefore is entrusted to children. And if any one of their hearers raise questions or contradict, they declare that he is incapable of knowing the truth and tell him nothing, saying that he belongs to the psychical,[1] not to the highest class. But should any one surrender himself completely to them like a silly sheep, and accept their system of redemption, he becomes inflated at once, imagines that he is neither in heaven nor on earth, but already within the "Pleroma," and has embraced his angel. He struts about with conceited gait like a crowing cock. Some of them say that the superman [2] ought to live a correct life. But the majority, who have become scoffers, as if they were already perfected, living without reverence and contemptuously, call themselves "the spiritual" and declare that they already know the place of their consolation,[3] which is within the Pleroma.'

[In the next chapter he gives the Gnostic views of Jesus Christ, which he proceeds to refute.]

III. 16. 1. 'Some say that Jesus was the receptacle of Christ, on whom the Christ descended as a dove, and after revealing the unnameable Father, withdrew in a manner invisible to all in heaven and on

[1] A reference to the threefold division of mankind by the Gnostics: the material, the psychical, the spiritual.

[2] Nietzsche's "superman," "hominem qui sit desuper veniens" anticipated by these false philosophers and Gnostics.

[3] *refrigerium*. See Tertullian, *Apol.* 39.

earth. Jesus was the Son, but Christ the Father,[1] and God was the Father of Christ. Others hold that the Christ only suffered in a fictitious way, being naturally incapable of suffering. The Valentinians say that it was the Jesus of the dispensation who passed through Mary, and upon her the Saviour, who is called Christ, descended from above, and that he shared with the former his power and his name; so that death was destroyed by the former, and the Father revealed by the Saviour who descended. Thus they verbally confess One Christ Jesus, but their meaning is different from ours. For it is their belief, as we have said already, that the Christ who was sent by the Only-begotten to establish the Pleroma was one, that the Saviour sent to glorify the Father was another, and that he of the dispensation, who suffered, was yet another.'

III. 16. 2. 'We have already shown from John's discourse that he only knew of one and the same Word of God, and him the Only-begotten, who became incarnate for our salvation, Jesus Christ our Lord. And Matthew, knowing one and the same Jesus Christ, expounding his human generation from a virgin, as God promised to raise up for David, as he had previously done to Abraham, an eternal King from the fruit of his body (Ps. cxxxii. 11), says, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ the Son of David, the son of Abraham." And then, to free our minds from all suspicion about Joseph, he says, "But the birth of Christ was on this wise" [here follows the angelic utterance, Matt. i. 20–23],[2]

[1] The Patripassians held a different view. They regarded the Father and Son as identical in Person. They were practically Sabellians. Tertullian and Hippolytus wrote against Noetus and Praxeas, arguing that if this was the case, then the Father suffered and died.

[2] This is the reading of O.L., Vulg., Cur., and of several critics and editors.

showing that the promise made to the fathers was fulfilled, that the Son of God was born of the Virgin, and that he was the Saviour Christ proclaimed by the prophets, and not as these say, "Jesus was he who was born of Mary, but Christ he who descended from on high." Matthew could have said, "The birth of Jesus was on this wise," but the Holy Spirit, foreseeing that there would be perverters, and guarding against their deceit, says, through Matthew, "The birth of Christ was on this wise." And he is called Emmanuel,[1] lest by chance you should regard him as merely man, but that you should believe Jesus and Christ to be one and the same.'

III. 16. 2. 'Paul in his letter to the Romans gives the same account: "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, appointed for the Gospel of God which He promised by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures regarding His Son, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God in power by the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead *of Jesus Christ our Lord*"[2] (Rom. i. 1–4) [he quotes Rom. ix. 5; Gal. iv. 4, 5; Col. i. 14, 15]; clearly showing that He is one God who made the promise through the prophets concerning His Son, and that the one Lord Jesus Christ who was of the seed of David according to his birth from Mary, was declared to be the Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness, the Son of God being made the Son of man (that through him we may obtain the adoption), his manhood conveying, containing and embracing the Son of God.'[3]

III. 16. 3. 'Mark also says, "the beginning of the

[1] Irenæus writes with "E," after LXX; it should be "I." The Hebrew is *immānu-ēl*, "with us God" (Isa. vii. 14).

[2] These last words also in the Syriac, but not in the Greek.

[3] His reference is to the humanity of Christ. In III. 19. 1 "*man* blended with the Word" refers to mankind.

Gospel of Jesus Christ," knowing that one and the same Jesus Christ was the Son of God, " the Father's messenger of great counsel " [1] (Isa. ix. 6).' [He quotes the *Nunc Dimittis*.]

III. 16. 4. 'For already he made his spoil of men, removing their ignorance and making a division of those who knew him, as Esaias saith, " Call his name Maher-shalal-hash-baz " [2] (Isa. viii. 3). Whom the Magi seeing and adoring, and bringing gifts and kneeling before the eternal King, went away by another route, not through the way of the Assyrians. " For before the boy will know to call his father or mother, he will receive the riches of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria against (*contra* or *coram*) the King of Assyria." [3] Wherefore he snatched away the children who were in the house of David, whose happy lot it was to be born at that time, to send them before him into his kingdom since he became an infant, preparing infants to be martyrs.'

III. 16. 5. [He quotes our Lord's words to the two disciples after his resurrection as given by St. Luke, and says:] 'The Gospel did not know, then, any other Son of man but he who was born of Mary and suffered. Neither do they know of a Christ who flew away before his Passion from Jesus. But this Jesus Christ, who was born, it knows to be Son of God, and also that the same suffered and rose again, as John the disciple of the Lord says: " But these things are written that ye may believe that Jesus is Christ the Son of God, and that believing

[1] After LXX. Hebrew *abi-ad*, meaning " Father everlasting." So in *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 56, and Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 76.

[2] The Hebrew meaning of which is " Swift of spoil, hasty of prey." Lat. Iren., " Velociter spolia, celeriter dispartire."

[3] See also Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 77. This text was considered in the early Church to refer to the visit of the Magi.

ye may have eternal life in his name" (John xx. 31).'

[Here follows a splendid passage on the Incarnate Word.]

III. 16. 6. 'They err from the truth because their view is opposed to Him who is truly God, not knowing that His Only-begotten Word, who is always present with the human race, united and blended with his own creatures according to the Father's pleasure, and being made flesh,[1] that he is Jesus Christ our Lord, who both suffered for us and rose on our behalf, and will come again in the glory of the Father to raise all flesh, and to manifest salvation, and to show the rule of a just judgment to all under him. Therefore, there is one God the Father, and one Christ Jesus our Lord, who cometh by a universal dispensation, and sums up all things into himself. Man is in every respect the formation of God, and therefore he recapitulates[2] men into himself, the invisible becoming visible, the incomprehensible comprehensible, the one superior to suffering becoming subject to suffering, and the Word becoming man.[3] Thus he summeth up all things in himself, that as the Word of God is supreme in heavenly and spiritual and invisible matters, he may also have the dominion in things visible and material; and that by taking to himself the pre-eminence[4] and

[1] *caro* (σάρξ), synecdoche for human nature in its entirety. This saves us from the error of Apollinarius, who put the Logos in the place of the human *nous*, or rational intelligence of Christ's humanity. It was a truncated humanity at best. We regard the personality of Christ as residing wholly in the Logos.

[2] The "recapitulatio" (ἀνακεφαλαίωσις) is the favourite term of Justin and his pupil to express the relation of Christ to the universe and to humanity.

[3] These stately measured phrases recall Ignatius' letter to Polycarp, c. 3.

[4] *primatum*. Later in the sense of "primacy."

constituting himself head of the Church, he may draw all things in due course unto himself.'

III. 16. 7. 'With him nought is unfinished or untimely. For all these things were known beforehand of the Father, but were accomplished by the Son in a manner that was fitting and appropriate and at the right time. So when Mary hurried him in the matter of the wonderful "sign" of the wine, and wished to share in the miraculous cup[1] before the time, the Lord, rebuking her *untimely haste*,[2] said, "What is there to me and to thee, woman? Mine hour has not yet come" (John ii. 4). The saying of Paul, "When the fullness of time was come God sent His Son," means that our Lord, being one and the same, both resourceful (rich) and great, accomplished in their appointed order, season, and time all things that existed in the foreknowledge of the Father. For he zealously performs the bountiful and manifold will of the Father, being the Saviour of those who are saved, the Lord of those who are under his dominion, and the God of all things which have been made, the Only-begotten of the Father, both the Christ who was foretold and the Word of God, who became incarnate when the time was fulfilled in which the Son of God should become the Son of man.'

[Here follows a short summary of the Gnostic views of our Lord. Such divisions of his Personality

[1] *compendii* poculo. See *compendialiter* . . . factum est vinum, II. 13. 5, where the contrast is between the natural wine and the wine made by this shortened process. Cf. III. 18. 1, *in compendio* nobis salutem praestans (in a concentrated and summary manner).

[2] Irenæus, Chrysostom, Theophylact, etc., fall under the anathema of the Council of Trent for imputing imperfection to the Virgin, so Feuardent remarks here. Harvey also points out that Augustine, who says, "Mariae corpus *inde* (i.e. *a concupiscentia*) venerit" (*c. Jul. Pel.* v. 52), is under the anathema of Rome for not holding the Immaculate Conception.

and his Manhood and Godhead give point to the word of the Nicene Creed: "And in *one* Lord Jesus Christ."]

III. 16. 8. 'They are, therefore, outside the pale of Christianity who, under the cloak of knowledge, understand Jesus to be one and Christ another, and the Only-begotten a third, different from whom, again, is the Word; and who say that the Saviour is yet another creature, being an emission from the æons. They are in sheep's clothing, in their outer speech appearing like to us, but are inwardly wolves. Their opinion is death-dealing. For they invent many Gods and Fathers, and cut up and divide into many parts the Son of God.' [1]

[The following is a strong statement of the hypostatic union of Christ, and is an answer by anticipation to the Nestorian view condemned at the Council of Ephesus, 431.]

III. 16. 9. 'The Apostle Paul knew that Jesus Christ was one and the same [he quotes Rom. vi. 3 f.; v. 6–10], in the most clear manner announcing that this same Christ who was seized, who suffered and shed his blood for us is the Son of God, who rose again and was taken up (*assumptus est*) into the heavens, as he himself says, "Christ died, nay, rose again, who is at the right hand of God" (Rom. viii. 34), and "Knowing that Christ, rising [2] from the dead, dieth no more" (Rom. vi. 9). For he, foreseeing through the Spirit the "subdivisions" made

[1] He now quotes from the Second Epistle of John, which he assigns to John the disciple of the Lord. This Epistle is not in the Syriac. He also quotes from 1 John iv. 3, giving the reading ὃ λύει τὸν Ιησοῦν, he who divides, or annuls, Jesus Christ, for "he who confesses not," with Vulgate and many early Fathers, Tertullian, etc. Polycarp (in letter to Philippians) supports the other reading.

[2] *resurgens* (Greek ἐγερθείς, being raised). So Vulg.

by these false teachers, and wishing to take away every opportunity of dissension, says, "If the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He who raised up Christ from the dead will also quicken your mortal bodies" (Rom. viii. 11), all but saying to those who wish to hear, "Do not err, Christ Jesus the Son of God is one and the same, who through his passion reconciled us to God and rose from the dead, and is at the right hand of God, and is every whit perfected,[1] who, when he was smitten, did not strike back. For he himself truly saved us; for he himself is the Word of God, he himself the Only-begotten of the Father, Christ Jesus our Lord."'

[Here follow some important passages on the relation of the Divine Spirit to the Son of God and to man through the Son.]

III. 17. 1. 'Instead of saying that Christ descended upon Jesus, the Apostles declared that it was the Spirit of God who descended as a dove upon him. As Isaiah said, "The Spirit of God shall rest upon him" (Isa. xi. 2). And again, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me" (Isa. lxi. 1). Of that Spirit the Lord says, "For it is not ye that speak, but it is the Spirit of your Father who speaketh in you" (Matt. x. 20). And again, when giving his disciples the power to regenerate into God,[2] he said, "Go and teach all nations, baptizing

[1] *perfectus*. Cf. Heb. vii. 28: Filium in aeternum perfectum, Vulg. (τετελειωμένον, cf. xii. 23; v. 9. τελειωθείς, Vulg. consummatus).

[2] potestatem regenerationis in Deum = τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως εἰς θεόν. Irenæus held Baptismal Regeneration strongly. See I. 22. 1, where he says that certain heretics were suborned by Satan to deny that baptism which is a *regeneration into God*. The term *anagennesis* was often used of baptism in the early Church. For Clement's use see *Clement of Alexandria*, S.P.C.K., p. 234 f.

them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit" (Matt. xxviii. 19). He promised through the prophets to pour him forth in the last times upon His servants and handmaidens, that they may prophesy (Joel ii. 29). Wherefore He descended upon the Son of God, who had become the Son of man, becoming accustomed with him (the Son) to dwell in the race of man and to rest upon men, and to dwell in the creation of God, performing the Father's will among men, and renewing them from their old life into the newness of Christ. This Spirit David sought for the human race, saying, "Strengthen me with Thy free [1] Spirit" (Ps. li. 12). Luke says He descended after the ascension (*ascensus*) of our Lord on Pentecost upon the disciples with the power over all nations to admit them to life and to open the new covenant to them. Wherefore they sang a hymn to God harmoniously in every language, the Spirit uniting the distant tribes [2] and offering the firstfruits of all nations to the Father. Our Lord promised to send us the Paraclete to prepare us for God. Just as we could not make out of dry wheat a single lump, much less a single loaf, so neither could we, being many, be united (*unum* [3]) in Christ Jesus without the heavenly water. And as the dry ground, if it receives not moisture, cannot yield fruit, so we, being at first like a dry tree, could never produce fruit without "bounteous rain from above" (Ps. lxviii. 9). For our bodies are united (with

[1] The Latin *principali* represents the LXX ἡγεμονικῷ. In the Hebrew Scriptures the Holy Spirit is treated more as an Influence than a Person. The Hebrew *n'dîbah* means "willing," "freely bestowed." See Judges v. 29, where the verb is used of "volunteers." *Nâdîb* also means "prince."

[2] A reference to the reunion of Israel in Christ.

[3] Cf. "I and my Father are one" (*unum*, ἕν), John x. 30.

Christ) by that laver which leads to immortality,[1] but our souls by the Spirit. Wherefore both (*i. e.* the laver and the Spirit) are necessary, since both (body and soul) advance in the life of God. The Lord pitied the Samaritan sinner and promised her the living water, and that she would never thirst having in herself the water that springeth to eternal life (John iv. 7 f.), which the Lord, receiving as a gift from his Father, gave himself to those who have a share in him, sending the Holy Spirit over the whole earth.'

III. 17. 2. 'Gideon, foreseeing this gracious gift, changed his petition about the fleece, prophesying over it, on which alone there was dew at first (Judges vi. 37), the drought that was to be, that is, that the people would not have the Holy Spirit. But upon all the ground there was dew. This means the Spirit of God who descended upon our Lord, even "the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and strength, the Spirit of knowledge and godliness, and the Spirit of the fear of the Lord" (Isa. xi. 2). Him He gave to the Church, sending the Paraclete from heaven over the whole earth. Wherefore, we need the "dew of God" so that we burn not, nor become unfruitful, but may have an advocate[2] whenever we have an accuser. The Lord commended to the Holy Spirit his man (*i. e.* humanity) who had fallen among thieves, upon whom he himself had shown mercy, giving two royal denaria,[3]

[1] Holy Baptism, "lavacrum," reading "*illud quod* est ad incorruptionem." Cf. Titus iii. 5. Cited in V. 15. 3, "lavacro regenerationis." The reading "illam quae est ad . . ." could only mean "that unity with Christ which leads to immortality."

[2] This is the original meaning of *Paracletus*.

[3] Neuter as in Plautus. This is a popular exposition of the relation of the Three Divine Persons to one another and to man.

that we, receiving through the Spirit the image and superscription of the Father and the Son, might make good use of the coin entrusted to us.'

III. 17. 4. 'The Spirit, then, descended according to the prearranged plan, and the Son of God, who was also the Word of the Father, came in the fullness of time and became incarnate in man, and fulfilled the whole human economy, even our Lord Jesus, ever one and the same, as the Lord himself bears witness, the Apostles confess and the prophets proclaim. Their doctrine is false who have devised ogdoads, tetrads and unreal appearances, who destroy the Spirit and divide Jesus Christ. Wherefore it behoves thee and all who attend to this Scripture, and are anxious for their salvation, not to yield without a struggle when they hear their discourses. For they say the same things as believers, but with a different meaning. Indeed, their meaning is contrary to ours and blasphemous, and destructive to those who, beguiled by the similarity of terms, are inoculated by the poison of their different opinion, just as if one, giving another gypsum mixed with water instead of milk, should mislead him by the colour. So said one superior to us about all who in any way corrupt the things of God and adulterate the truth: "Gypsum is wrongly mixed with the Divine milk."'[1]

III. 18. 1. 'Since we have clearly shown that the Word who was in the beginning with God, through whom all things were made and who was always present with the human race, even he in the last times according to the time appointed of the Father, was united with His creation, and became man subject to suffering, the argument of those who say, "If he was born *then*, he was not Christ *before*," is

[1] Gypsum in liquid preparation was used by the Roman nobles as a poison. See Pliny, *N. H.* 36. 24.

overcome. For we have shown that the Son of God, who was always existent with the Father, did not begin to be then; for when he became incarnate and man, he summed up in himself the long roll of humanity, supplying us in a concise manner[1] with salvation. So that what we lost in Adam, namely the being in the image and likeness of God, we might recover in Christ Jesus.'

III. 18. 2. 'Because it was impossible for that man who had been once beaten and knocked out through disobedience to refashion[2] himself and obtain the reward of victory, and also it was impossible that the man who had fallen under the power of sin should receive salvation, the Son accomplished both things, being the Word of God, descending from the Father, and becoming incarnate, and descending to death, and consummating the plan of our salvation. And he (Paul) explains the reason why the Word of God did this, saying, "For this cause Christ both lived and died and rose again,[3] that he might be the Lord both of the living and the dead" (Rom. xiv. 9).'

[He quotes 1 Cor. xv. 3 f., 12; Rom. xiv. 15; Gal. iii. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 11, to show that Paul on every occasion when speaking of his suffering, humanity, death and atonement used the name Christ.]

III. 18. 3. 'For it was Jesus Christ who suffered for us, who died and rose, who descended and ascended, the Son of God who became the Son of man, as the very name signifies. For in the name of Christ is implied the Anointer, the Anointed, and the Unction wherewith the Anointment has been

[1] *in compendio* (συντόμως).

[2] *replasmare*, recreate, sc. *se*.

[3] This is a different reading from the Greek "died, rose, revived." It is possible that Irenæus changed it purposely to express the atoning efficacy of the *Life* of Christ.

made. It is the Father who anoints, the Son who is anointed, and the Spirit who is the Unction, as the Word declares by Isaiah: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because He hath anointed me," thus indicating the anointing Father, the anointed Son, and the Unction which is the Spirit.' [1]

[He proceeds to quote sayings of our Lord with regard to his own suffering and crucifixion, Matt. xvi. 13 f., 21–25; x. 17 f., 28 and 38, and concludes:]

III. 18. 5. 'For he himself promised that he would confess them before his Father who confessed his name before men; but would deny those who denied him, and would bring to shame those who were ashamed to confess him. But in spite of this certain have waxed so audacious that they even spurn the martyrs and abuse those who are slain for their confession of their Lord, and suffer all things foretold by our Lord, and in this respect attempt to follow in his steps, becoming the witnesses [2] in death of him who died, whom we reckon among the martyrs.'

[He is now concerned to prove the reality of our Lord's suffering, which the Gnostics denied.]

III. 18. 6. 'For if he did not suffer, there is no thanks to him, since there was no Passion. And we have been deceived by him who exhorts us to endure what he did not endure himself. We, too, shall be superior to the Master through suffering and bearing what he never suffered nor bore. But as our Lord alone is truly Master, the Son of God is truly good and enduring, even the Word of God the Father, who was made the Son of man. For he

[1] Cf. *Apostolic Preaching*, c. 47. See also III. 6. 1, where an explanation of Ps. xlv. 7, "therefore God hath anointed thee," is given. The reference is to Is. lxi. 1.

[2] passibilis *martyres* facti. "Martyr" is used here in both senses of *witness* and *sufferer*.

agonized and conquered. As a man he contended on behalf of the fathers, and through his obedience he discharged the debt of disobedience; for he bound the strong man, set free the weak, and gave salvation to his own creation by destroying sin. For he is a most holy and merciful Lord, and one who loveth the race of men.

III. 18. 7. Therefore, as we have said, he caused human nature to cling to God and to be one with God. For had not man banished the enemy of man, that enemy had not been justly vanquished. And had not God granted salvation, we had never possessed it securely. And had not man been joined to God, he could never have shared in incorruptibility. For it behoved him, who was the mediator of God and man, by his relationship with both to lead both into friendship and harmony, presenting man to God and revealing God to man. In what manner could we be partakers of His adoption unless we had received from Him (God) through the Son that communion which is with Himself? Unless His Word incarnate had imparted it to us. Wherefore he came through every age,[1] restoring to each its communion with God. Therefore they who do not believe in a real incarnation are still under the old condemnation, and are *patrons of sin*, not believing in the conquest of death (cf. III. 23. 7, *advocatos serpentis*). But when the Law given by Moses came, and testified concerning sin, that he is a sinner, it took his kingdom from him, revealed him as a robber and murderer and not as a king; but laid a burden upon man who had sin in himself, showing him to be worthy of death. But as the "law is spiritual" (Rom. vii. 14), it only made the sin apparent, but did not remove it. For sin had no power over the Spirit but only over the man. It therefore

[1] Cf. II. 22. 4.

behoved him who assayed to slay sin and redeem man, who was guilty of death, to become that very thing which he was,[1] namely, man, who had indeed been drawn into bondage by sin and was held fast by death, so that sin should be destroyed by man, and man should go forth from death. For as through the disobedience of one man, first to be made of the virgin soil, many were made sinners and lost their life; so it was necessary that by the obedience of one man, first to be born of a virgin, many should be made righteous and receive salvation. Accordingly the Word became flesh. God recapitulating the ancient creation of man in Himself, in order to slay sin, to remove death's sting, and restore man to the life.'

[He replies to those who regarded our Lord as the son of Joseph.]

III. 19. 1. 'Again, they who regard him merely as man, and the son of Joseph, continuing in the bondage of the old disobedience, die apart[2] from the Word of God, and without the freedom that is given through the Son. For ignoring him who is God with us, the Virgin-born Emmanuel, they are deprived of his gift,[3] which is life eternal; and not receiving the Word of incorruption, they remain in mortal flesh, and become debtors to death, not accepting the antidote of life, to whom the Word says: "I have said, ye are all the children of the most High and gods, but as men ye die"[4] (Ps. lxxxii.

[1] In this passage Christ is described as victorious through the reality of his sufferings and death, and as having achieved man's release from the bondage of sin by the reality of his obedience as man, and as having destroyed sin by the reality of his death and Passion.

[2] Lit. not yet blended with. *nondum commixti Verbo* expresses intimate union of believer and Master.

[3] *privantur*, seems to be in middle form, *deprive* themselves.

[4] After LXX, transposing the clauses. The Latin translator corrects this. The word *dei* (θεοί) represents *Elohim* (judges).

6, 7). This he said to those who refused the gift of adoption, and despising the Incarnation of the pure generation of the Word of God, and depriving man of that ascent to God, show ingratitude to the Word of God who became incarnate on their behalf. For the Word became man, that man united[1] with the Word and receiving his adoption might become the Son of God. For we could not otherwise enjoy incorruption and immortality unless we had been united to incorruption and immortality. And how could this be done unless incorruption and immortality were first made that which we are, so that the corruptible might be absorbed by the incorruption and the mortal by immortality, and that so we might enjoy the adoption of sons?'

III. 19. 2. 'Wherefore "who shall declare his generation?" (Isa. liii. 8). But he knows him to whom the heavenly Father revealed to his understanding, that he, the Son of God, who is "not born of the will of the flesh or of the will of man" (John i. 13) is the Christ, the Son of the living God. That no one else of the sons of Adam is called God or Lord absolutely *per se*, we have shown from the Scriptures. Any one who has attained even the smallest grain of truth can see that he is, peculiarly above all other men who then existed, God and Lord and Eternal King and Only-begotten, and the Word Incarnate proclaimed by all the prophets, Apostles and by the Spirit Himself. The Scriptures would not have testified these things of him if he were only man like other men.

See John x. 34–36, "If he called them 'gods' unto whom the Word of God came." The Italic version has *moriemini*, "Ye shall die," after the Hebrew.

[1] *commixtus Verbo Dei*: this describes union of believers with Christ, not union of his natures in one Person. Harvey is wrong, therefore, in saying "*commixtus* bears taint of Eutychianism."

But the Divine Scriptures bear witness to both these things of him, that he had a begetting from the Most High Father, conspicuous above all others; and also a conspicuous birth from the Virgin. And that he was a man uncomely[1] and capable of suffering, rode upon the foal of an ass, was given vinegar and gall to drink, was scorned by the people and descended into death (Zech. ix. 9; Ps. lxix. 21); and also that he was the holy Lord, the Wonderful, Counsellor, comely in form,[2] mighty God, who cometh on clouds as the judge of all mankind, the Scriptures declare (Dan. vii. 13, 26).'

III. 19. 3. 'For as he was man that he might be tempted (tried), so he was Word that he might be glorified, *the Word remaining quiescent*[3] in the temptation and crucifixion and death, and assisting his humanity in the victory, endurance, service,[4] resurrection and assumption. He, then, is the Son of God, our Lord, the existent Word of the Father and the Son of man, for he had a human birth from Mary, who herself was human and of human origin, and became the Son of man. Wherefore the Lord Himself gave us a sign in the depth and the height above, which man did not demand because he could not expect that a virgin could become pregnant, namely, that

[1] This idea was taken from Justin, who interpreted Isa. liii. 4 literally. Jerome went to greater extremes, styling Christ *leprosus*, after his version of Isa. liii. 4.

[2] Isa. ix. 6, *abi-'ad*. See above, III. 16. 2, where it is translated after LXX *Patris nuntius*, messenger of the Father. It read *'ed* (witness) for *'ad* (spoil, eternity). Irenæus, uncertain of the translation, connected *abi* with the verb "to desire" (*abah*).

[3] Irenæus' solution of the difficulty connected with the relation of the human and the Divine in Christ. Later writers speak of a *kenosis*, or self-emptying, after Phil. ii. 7 (Greek). I.'s word is ἡσυχάζων.

[4] χρηστεύεσθαι in 1 Cor. xiii. 3, love is kind (of the Divine beneficence).

one could be a virgin and yet bear a son, and that the child was " God with us," and descended into the lower parts of the earth [1] seeking the lost sheep, which indeed was his own creation, and ascended into heaven, presenting and commending to the Father the mankind he had found, offering [2] the firstfruits of man's resurrection in himself. This means that as the " head " arose from the dead, so the remaining " body " of all humanity, which is found, when the time of its condemnation for its disobedience shall be fulfilled, may rise again, growing together through joints and nerves, and strengthened by the increase that God gives, each member having its own special and appropriate position in the body (Eph. iv. 16; Col. ii. 19).'

[In this passage he refers to Jonah's story, in which he sees a modern application.]

III. 20. 1. 'God showed His magnanimity, therefore, when man failed, foreseeing the victory that would be achieved by His Word. When his strength was made perfect in weakness, he displayed the kindness and wonderful power of God. God allowed man to be swallowed up by that great serpent, the author of sin. Not that he might perish totally, but arranging and preparing long before the plan of His salvation; so that man receiving an unexpected salvation from God, might rise from the dead and glorify God, incessantly returning Him thanks for his salvation, and might never have a different view

[1] Not into " hell " as place of punishment. See Eph. iv. 9, " descended into the lower parts of the earth." For the origin of the latest clause of the Apostles' Creed see Pearson, p. 33, " Descended into Hell."

[2] This passage only in Latin. *faciens*, probably in a sacrificial sense of offer, as the " firstfruits " were presented to God in the temple. Cf. Verg., *E.* 3. 77 : Quum *faciam* vitula pro frugibus (cf. ῥέζειν).

of God, so as to imagine that his immortality is his own by nature, and not understanding the truth, might be lifted up with the idea that he was like God.'

III. 20. 2. 'Such, therefore, was the magnanimity of God that man passing through every experience and obtaining the knowledge of moral discipline, and then coming to the resurrection from the dead, and learning by experience from whence he obtained deliverance, should ever be grateful to God, from whom he received the gift of incorruption, and so might love Him more, for he to whom more is given loves more (Luke vii. 43). And so he should recognize that he himself is mortal and weak, and should understand that God is so immortal and powerful that He can give immortality to the mortal and eternal life to the temporal, and also that the other powers of God have been displayed towards him in order that he may be trained thereby to feel how great God is. For God, aye the works of God, are the glory of man, and man is the receptacle of all His wisdom and power. As the skill of the physician is proved by his patient, God is manifested in the case of man. . . . Wherefore, Paul saith, "God hath concluded all [1] in unbelief that He might show mercy on all" (Rom. xi. 32), with regard to man who was disobedient to God, and cast down from immortality, but then obtained mercy, receiving the adoption which is through the Son of God. For he obtaining without pride true glory from this creation and the Creator, and abiding in His love and obedience and in giving of thanks, will receive a greater glory, even an advance in the likeness of him who died for him. For even he was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, that he might condemn sin, and cast it as a guilty thing out of the flesh, and might challenge

[1] Latin *omnia*, represents *τὰ πάντα*. Greek has *τοὺς πάντας*. *πάντα* may have been used in the sense of "every one."

man to the imitation of God, marking [1] him out for God as his own follower, and setting [2] over him the paternal law for the seeing of God, and granting to him to have the Father within him [3] (John xiv. 23). This did the Word of God who dwelt in man, and became the Son of man, in order that he might accustom man to understand God, and accustom God to dwell in man according to the Father's pleasure. Therefore the Lord himself—since it was the Lord who saved them because they could not be saved by themselves—was the sign of our salvation, even he [4] who was the Virgin-born Emmanuel.'

[He proceeds to argue that the Word became flesh from some passages in the Old Testament. He quotes one passage as from Isaiah which Justin [5] accused the Jews of having removed from Jeremiah. It is quoted four times by Irenæus, and each time with divergencies.[6]]

III. 21. 1. 'God therefore became man, and the Lord himself saved us, giving the sign of the virgin. The interpretation of those who dare to render the passage, "Behold, a young woman shall conceive and bear a son" (Isa. vii. 14) is, consequently, wrong. This is the translation of Theodotion [7] and Aquila,

[1] *assignans Deo.* Cf. *assigna,* Marce tabellas (Persius, 5. 81), "seal the tablets." It might also mean "committing him" or "appointing him to God."

[2] in paternam *imponens* regulam, lit. embarking upon (setting upon) the paternal rule.

[3] "We will come and make our *abode* with him."

[4] *eum,* sc. *dedit,* gave. [5] *Dial.* 72.

[6] The passage is, "The holy Lord of Israel remembered his dead who slept in the land of sepulture and descended to preach his salvation, so that he might save them." Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 6. He also quotes Habak. iii. 3, as "Deus ex Africo veniet" (south-west). Hebrew has "Teman."

[7] This version, finished A.D. 181, gives a *terminus a quo* for the writing of the treatise. Aquila wrote about A.D. 130. *'almah* in Hebrew means "young woman"; *bthulah* is "virgin."

Jewish proselytes both, and they have been followed by the Ebionites, who said that Jesus was born of Joseph.'

[Here follows an account of the Septuagint version, which he says was made by order of Ptolemæus, the son of Lagus. Clement of Alex., *Strom.* I. 22, says, "Some believed it was made by order of Philadelphus." The translation was made probably in the last year of the one and first year of the other (283), and by Greeks of Alexandria. The story of the seventy elders and the literal agreement of the seventy copies was started probably by Aristæus, who was followed by Philo, Justin Martyr, etc. Jerome did not believe it. Irenæus says that the Scriptures are interpreted by "inspiration (ἐπίπνοιαν) of God," and that God "inspired" (ἐνέπνευσεν) Esdras the priest.]

III. 21. 3. 'Our Lord was born about the forty-first year of the empire of Augustus.' [1]

[He argues that the same Spirit who predicted in the prophets the nature of our Lord's advent, interpreted in the seventy elders (who have ἡ παρθένος, the virgin, whereas Theodotion and Aquila read νεᾶνις, young women) the words of prophecy, and announced in the Apostles the coming of the kingdom of heaven to those who believed in the Virgin-born Emmanuel. He says that the child of a young woman

[1] Cæsar was murdered 44 B.C., March 15. He probably reckoned from that date, as Octavius did not assume the title of Augustus until 27 B.C. Patristic testimony favours a date between 3 B.C. and 2 B.C. for our Lord's birth. Clement of Alex. (*Strom.*, I. 147), "Our Lord was born in the 28th year of the reign of Augustus" (counting from the battle of Actium, 31 B.C.). Hippolytus (*Com. on Daniel*), "Our Lord was born on Dec. 25th in the 42nd year of the reign of Augustus." See art. "Dates" by present writer in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and Gospels*, p. 410.

would be nothing to arrest attention, but that the unexpected child of a virgin would be a sign of an unexpected salvation. He argues (III. 21. 9) that if our Lord was the son of Joseph he could neither be king, nor heir according to Jeremiah. For Jechoniah (Jer. xxii. 24 f.) and all his were removed from the throne, and with regard to Jehoiakim (Jer. xxxvi. 30), he said there would be no one of his family to set on the throne of David.]

'They, then, who say that he was the son of Joseph banish themselves from the kingdom, falling under the curse which fell upon Jechoniah and his seed. This was purposely said about Jechoniah, for the Spirit foresaw what these evil teachers would teach, to the intent that they may learn that from his seed, that is from Joseph, the eternal king was not born, but he was raised up according to the promise of God, from the body of David, who sums up all things in himself." III. 21. 10. 'And he summed up the ancient creation in himself. [He quotes Rom. v. 19.] And as the protoplast Adam had his substance of the virgin earth and was fashioned by the hand of God, that is, the Word of God, so the existent Word himself, summing up Adam in himself, duly received from Mary, still a virgin, the birth of that nature in which Adam was summed up.'

[1] W. C. Allen (Matthew, *Inter. Crit. Com.*, pp. 4–8) points out that Matt. i. 11 should read, " Josiah begat Joachim and his brethren, and Joachim begat Jechoniah." A more important text is Matt. i. 16. See W. C. Allen's remarks on the readings there. He holds it possible that the earliest form of text is given in the Sinaitic Syriac: " Jacob begat Joseph, and Joseph (to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin) begat Jesus who was called Christ." He was the reputed though not actual father. But both Prof. Lobstein and Prof. Schmiedel, neither of whom accept the Virgin-birth, attach little importance to this reading. See present writer's *Christ and His Critics*, p. 29.

III. 22. 1. 'If, therefore, the first Adam had a human father, it would be natural to expect that the second Adam was born of Joseph. But if the first were taken from the soil and formed by God, it behoved the man, who recapitulated in himself the man formed by God, to have a similar kind of birth. Why, then, did not God again take earth, instead of causing the formation to be from Mary? In order to prevent another creation taking place, lest that creation might be the one to be saved, and in order that the very same creation might be recapitulated, the likeness being retained throughout. They are far astray, then, who say that he took nothing of the Virgin in order that they may get rid of his inheritance of the flesh and his likeness to us. For if he did not take the substance of the flesh from man, he neither became man nor the Son of man, and if he was not made that which we were, there was nothing wonderful in his sufferings. Every one will allow that we consist of body taken from the ground,[1] and soul receiving spirit from God. Such the Word of God became, recapitulating his own creation in himself.' [He quotes Gal. iv. 4; Rom. i. 3, 4.]

III. 22. 2. 'Otherwise his coming down (*κάθοδος*) to Mary were superfluous. For why did he come down to her if he was to take nought from her? And if he took nought from Mary, he could not have received earthly food by which the earthly body is sustained; he had not felt hunger after fasting forty days; John had never said, "Jesus sat, being wearied with his journey" (John iv. 6); he had never wept over Lazarus nor sweated drops of blood; nor had he said, "my soul is exceeding

[1] Our body consists of chemical gases and elements found in its natural environment. This is the meaning of our body being formed of the dust of the earth.

sorrowful" (Matt. xxvi. 38); and blood and water had not issued from his pierced side (John xix. 34). For all these things are indications of the flesh which is taken from the earth and which he recapitulated in himself, saving his own handiwork.'

III. 22. 3. 'Accordingly, Luke shows that our Lord's pedigree back to Adam consists of seventy-two generations (Luke iii. 23 f.), connecting the end with the beginning, signifying that it is he who recapitulated all the scattered nations even from Adam, and all languages and every generation of man with Adam himself in himself. Wherefore Adam is called by Paul "the type of him who was to come" (Rom. v. 14), God preordaining that the first natural (psychical) man should be saved by the spiritual one. For since he existed before the creation as Saviour, it was necessary that there should come into existence something to be saved. [He contrasts Eve and Mary.] Mary the Virgin is found to be obedient, saying, "Behold, the handmaid of the Lord" (Luke i. 38). But Eve was disobedient, for she did not obey, though still a virgin. Adam was her husband, but she was still a maid—for they were still innocent, having to grow up before they could have children—and through her disobedience she became the cause of death to herself and the whole race. Even so Mary, having a husband and being still a maid, through her obedience became the means of salvation for herself and the whole race.[1] For the Lord being

[1] This parallel between Mary and Eve is also in Tertullian, see *De Carne Christi*, 17. Both followed Justin M. (*Dial.* 100), who described Eve as the mother of disobedience and death, but Mary as the mother of Him through whom God destroys the serpent and delivers from death those who repent and believe. On the subject of the alleged sinlessness (original and actual) of the Virgin see article "Mary" in Hastings' Dict. of the Bible, where ancient and modern views are quoted.

the first-begotten of the dead (Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5), and receiving into his bosom the early Fathers regenerated them into the life of God, himself becoming the beginning of the living as Adam was the beginning of the dying (1 Cor. xv. 22). Accordingly, Luke, though he began with Adam, traced his beginning back to the Lord, showing that it was not they who regenerated him, but he who regenerated them into the gospel of life (Luke iii. 38). Thus the knot of Eve's disobedience was loosed by the obedience of Mary. The knot which the Virgin Eve tied by her unbelief, the Virgin Mary opened[1] by her belief.'[2]

III. 22. 4. 'It was necessary that the Lord, coming to seek the lost sheep, and making the recapitulation of so great a dispensation, should save that man who was made after his image and likeness, even Adam, after he filled up the times of his condemnation. For the whole plan of the salvation, which concerns man, was made according to the will of the Father, so that God might not be conquered, nor His art injured. But God would have been defeated by the serpent's guile had the man, injured by the serpent, been cast altogether to death. But since God is invincible and merciful, He displayed His mercy even in the reproof of one and the probation of all. And through the second man he bound the strong man and seized his vessels[3] (Matt. xii. 29), and emptied

[1] *solvit*, cf. V. 19. 1, where the reading *salvatur* should be *solvitur*.

[2] Cf. Tert., *De Carne Christi*, "quod illa credendo deliquit haec credendo delevit," Mary's faith wiped out Eve's want of faith.

[3] σκεύη (vasa), a significant expression. Cf. Rom. ix. 22, "vessels of wrath," *i. e.* men deserving wrath; "vessels of pity," ver. 23. Acts ix. 15, σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς; so in Matt. xii. 29. σκεύη means those Satan had made, vessels of badness, instruments of vice. Luke xi. 22 has σκύλα, spoils.

death of its power, giving life to that man who had been given over to death (cf. Luke xi. 22).'

[He palliates the disobedience of Adam, urging that there were extenuating circumstances in his case as he was deceived by the devil, and that God took pity on him and saved him, who showed his penitence by making aprons of prickly fig leaves. "But he checked his transgression by the interposition of death, causing sin to cease and putting an end to it by the dissolution of flesh in the earth, so that man dying to sin should begin to live to God" (III. 23. 5).]

III. 23. 8. 'They are not trustworthy, who, like Tatian, the first to invent this foolish idea, deny the salvation of Adam, quoting the text: "In Adam all die" (1 Cor. xv. 22), but ignoring that "where sin abounded grace did much more abound" (Rom. v. 20). Such make themselves heretics, apostates from the truth, patrons (*advocatos*) of the serpent and of death.'

[He returns to the unity of the Church, which he shows is due to the continuity of the Spirit's work.]

III. 24. 1. 'It has been shown that the teaching of the Church is everywhere constant and abiding, and is supported by the testimony of the prophets, Apostles, and all the disciples, as we have proved, from the beginning, through the middle unto the end, right through the whole course of the dispensation of God, and the steadfast [1] plan of salvation which is expressed in our faith which has been received from the Church, which is maintained by us, and which is renewed by the Spirit of God, just as a beautiful plant when beginning to flower throws the bloom of its youth over the very vessel in which it grows.

[1] *solidam* = στερεάν, steadfast; cf. 1 Pet. v. 9. v.l. *solitam* = usual.

This gift of God has been entrusted to the Church, as breath was given to man, to this end that all the members receiving it might have life; and in it has been deposited the means of communion[1] with Christ, that is, the Holy Spirit, the earnest[2] of incorruption, the assurance of our faith, and the "altar-stairs that slope to God." For in the Church, he saith, God hath set Apostles, prophets and teachers (1 Cor. xii. 28), and all the other channels through which the Spirit works, whereof they do not partake who have left the Church. For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and every form of grace, for the Spirit is truth. Wherefore they do not share in Him, neither are they nurtured for life on the breasts of their mother, neither do they receive the crystal water that proceedeth from the Body of Christ,[3] but they dig out muddy ponds in the trenches, and drink the putrid water from the slime, avoiding the Church's faith lest they may be led back, and rejecting the Spirit lest they should be taught the truth.'

III. 24. 2. 'But alienated from the truth they wallow in every form of error, always changing their views, and having no sure knowledge, for they are not founded on the one rock (*petra*) but upon the sand.[4] Wherefore the Divine light does not shine upon them, since they have dishonoured and scorned God,

[1] *communicatio*, not fellowship (*communio*), but that which makes communion possible, or helps it. Cf. 1 Cor. x. 10, *communicatio sanguinis*.

[2] *arrha*, pledge (Heb. עֲרֻבּוֹן, pledge), ἀῤῥαβών.

[3] Notice that Irenæus calls the Church "Corpus Christi." He is the head, we are the body, σῶμα—"One body in Christ," 1 Cor. x. 17; Eph. ii. 16; Eph. iv. 4, "There is one body and one Spirit."

[4] Cf. 2 Pet. ii. (especially ver. 22), "the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire."

despising Him because He allowed man, in His great love and pity, to have knowledge of Him—a knowledge, indeed, which was not commensurate with His greatness or nature, but with the fact that He made and fashioned men, and breathed the breath of life into them, and sustains us by the creation, establishing all things by His Word, arranging all things by His Spirit. But foolishly imagining that there is a God above Him, whom no one can know, who has no communication with the human race, and does not manage the affairs of the world, an Epicurean deity, forsooth, who is useless to himself and others, and exercises no providence whatsoever.'

[He argues that even certain of the pagans, who have more morality and less superstition than the others, have been affected by this Divine providence, albeit slightly, but still they have confessed the Creator of this universe to be the foreseeing Father and organizer of our world. We may compare St. Paul at Athens, "for we are his offspring" (Acts xvii. 28). Irenæus proceeds to criticize Marcion's double deities, the "judicial" and the "benign."]

III. 25. 3. 'The "judicial" God, if he has not the goodness which is the characteristic of Deity, is not God, because he is no God in whom goodness is wanting. On the other hand, if He is good, but lacking in judicial authority, He has not the stamp of divinity. The love and the justice of God cannot,

[1] Cf. Horace, *Serm.* I. 5. 101, "Namque deos didici securum agere aevum" (I have learnt that the gods lead a life free from care). Cf. Lucr. 5. 85, "Well have they been taught that the gods live a life free from care." In 2. 646, these Epicurean deities are described as living in perpetua peace "far removed from our affairs and far apart." Cf Tennyson, "Lotus-eaters," "On the hills like gods together, careless of mankind." Velleius (*Cicero, N.D.* 1. 19) describes the Epicurean deity as "doing nothing but rejoicing in his wisdom and virtue."

then, be separated. He is Lord and Judge and Ruler of all. Justice demands judgment, but judgment doth wait upon wisdom; and in wisdom the Father excels. He is good and patient and merciful, and saves whom it is right to save. His goodness fails Him not, being used in justice, and His wisdom is never diminished. He is, therefore, both just and good, His mercy preventing and taking precedence of His justice.' [1]

III. 25. 5. 'Wherefore Plato is more devout than Marcion, for he admitted that the same God was both just and good, having power over all things, and executing judgment Himself, and thus expressed it: "And God, as He is the ancient Word and possesses the beginning, the middle, and the end of all existence, does everything rightly, moving around in the way of nature, while justice, the avenger of the Divine law, follows Him." And, again, he pointed out that the Maker and Framer of the universe is good, saying, "The good never feel envy," [2] and maintaining that the goodness of God is the original cause of the creation of the world.'

[1] Cf. Shakespeare—

> "And earthly power doth then shew likest God's
> When mercy seasons justice."

[2] *Timæus*, p. 29.

END OF VOL. I.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BRUNSWICK ST., STAMFORD ST., S.E., AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

Date Due

JAN 2 6 '56	400879		
FEB 8 '58			
FEB 4 '59			
[illegible]			
MAY 2 0 '63			
MAY 3 0 '63			
DEC 1 7 '63			
FEB [illegible] '64			
[illegible]			
NOV 2 6 1993			

Library Bureau Cat. No. 1137

281.3 Ir2t
CLAPP
3 5002 00371 1368
Irenaeus
The treatise of Irenæus of Lugdunum agai

BT 1313 .I713 1916 1

Irenaeus,

The treatise of Iren|us of
Lugdunum against the